

T H E  
L O Y A L T Y  
O F

Popish Principles

E X A M I N ' D.

In Answer to a late Book Entituled  
*STAFFORD'S Memoirs.*

With some Considerations in this  
present Juncture offer'd to Pro-  
testant Dissenters.

---

By *ROB. HANCOCK*, Fellow of *Clare-  
Hall* in *Cambridge*, and Rector of  
*Northill* in *Bedfordshire*.

---

LONDON, Printed by *S. Roycroft*, for *Thomas  
Flesher*, at the *Angel* and *Crown* in *St. Paul's  
Church-Yard*. 1682.

THE  
ROYALTY

of the

ROYALTY





## The PREFACE to the Christian R E A D E R.

**I**T may be expected that I should (according to Custom) say something towards the Recommendation of the following Discourse to the perusal of the Reader; and tell him what Motives I had to undertake this work. But the truth is, I have neither studied, nor ever seen any great Effects of this kind of Courtship. I know, the Weight and Importance of the Subject; the Honesty and Charitableness of the Design; the Truth and Evidence of the Matter; the Importunity of Friends, and the Authority of others whose Judgment we value above our own, are the common heads of Excuse in such Cases. If any or all of these will serve for an Apology, I

### The Preface to

I hope I have some right to them; if they will not, it must undergo the Readers Censure. However I shall acquaint him with the Scope of the whole Treatise, viz. To make a Faithful Representation of such Principles and Designs as (under a colour of Religion) do naturally tend to disturb the Publick Peace & Settlement of this Church and Kingdom; subvert the true Reformed Religion & Destroy Christian Charity, by fomenting Intestine Commotions or Foreign Usurpations. And if there be such a thing in the World (I am loath to call it Religion) as teaches men to advance it self by Treason and Bloodshed, by Falshood and Treachery, it is our Duty and Interest to detect the Fraud and Hypocrisy of it.

In the treating of this Subject,

I. I have not only justified the Charge of Disloyalty and Cruelty  
against

the Christian Reader.

against the Court and Church of Rome; but also examined and confuted the most plausible Arguments of Romish Loyalty and Charity.

2. Because the Doctrines and Practises of some reputed Protestants have given a deep Wound to the Reputation of our Religion; and some most horrid things have been taught and acted in this Nation, out of a real or pretended zeal for the Protestant Cause; I have vindicated the Honour & Peaceableness of the Reformation, and shewed from whence the most Fanatick Sectaries derived their Principles, by whom they were Influenced, and whom they gratified in that management of them.

3. I have given a brief account of Comprehension and Toleration; so far as they fell within the compass of the late Lord Staffords

The Preface to

Design; and I am sensible it would have been an Argument of weakness or arrogance in me to have entred upon a larger Discourse upon those Heads, so soon after the late Proposals of a great and learned Man for the Satisfaction of Dissenters. (A)

(A) Preface to the Unreasonableness of Separation, (printed 1681.)

Lastly, I have concluded with such Important Considerations to all sober Dissenting Protestants (whom I distinguish from wild Fanaticks) as I believe are necessary for the keeping out of Popery.

In the Prosecution of the whole Argument, I have neither made any uncharitable Reflections, nor charged any persons with the remote Consequences of their Doctrines. And (though I will not answer for all little Mistakes or Inadvertencies in the Writing or Printing) I have neither taken any Quotations upon trust, nor misrepresented.

the Christian Reader.

represented the words or sense of the Authors which I make use of.

But I must here informe the Reader, that in my Animadversions upon Staffords Memoirs I have not meddled with the Life and Actions, the Charge or Arraignment of the late Lord Stafford, the Depositions of the Witnesses or the Observations upon them: For I am not angry with the person of any Roman Catholick, nor do I love to trample upon the Grave of a dead man; besides, it doth not become me to go out of my own Profession, or discuss such matters as do not concern Religion. And yet I think I may safely say, that I have not omitted any thing, which looks like an Imputation in the Reformed, or a Vindication of the Roman Church and Religion.

The Preface to, &c.

If this Book should fall into the Hands of any of that Communion, I confess I have not much hope of convincing them, who by the very Principles of their Religion are bound to disbelieve their own Senses. If any of the Dissenting Protestants shall please to look into it, I have only this kindness (shall I say or justice?) to beg of them, that they would read the two last Chapters with the same sincerity and freedom from Passion, with which they were written; and then let them judge whether those Considerations and Advices are not as necessary to their own, as to our Safety.

Farewel.

---

The

## The Contents

---

### CHAP. I.

**T**He Principles of the R. Church and Religion destructive of piety and vertue. Three Cases where-in it is possible for R. Catholiques to be better than their Religion inclines or allows them to be. Of the Principles and Practises of his Majesties R. Catholique Subjects in the time of the late Rebellion. Of their Rebellion in Ireland; and the Advantage which the Kings Enemies in England made of it. Since his Majesties Restauration they refused to give him any reasonable security of their Allegiance for the future. Many Papists actually in Arms against King Charles the First in England; many others did him no Service: Upon what Motives the rest adhered to him. A Consult of the English Jesuits about taking away his Life. Of the Principles and Behaviour of the R. Catholiques

## The Contents.

*liques under the Usurped Powers:  
Of Mr. White's Book.*

### CHAP. II.

*The Treasons and Seditious in other Countries, especially the Bloody Wars in England, and the Murder of King Charles the First charged upon the Protestants. The Reformed Churches abroad, and the Church of England vindicated from this Imputation. The King brought to the Block by a prevailing Faction against the Consent of the Nobility and People of England. The Romish Faction had a great Influence on the beginning and progress of the Rebellion. The Troubles in Scotland fomented by Cardinal Richlieu's Agents. The Letter of the Scotch Covenanters to the French King. The Design of the Papists against the King discover'd Ann. 1640. What Influence they had on the War which followed in England, and upon the Kings death. Two Propositions added to the foregoing Discourse. 1. That the Grounds on which*



## The Contents.

*which the War against the King was justified were first laid by the prevailing Faction of the Roman Church. This Proposition proved from Gregory 1. Zachary, Gregory the 7th. &c. From Parsons, Creswel, Suarez, Bellarmine, Bouchier, Mariana, Fr. de Verone, Reynolds. They which have written in defence of the War, or of the Kings death go upon the same Principles. 2. That in the Reign of King Charles the First, the Pope animated his Subjects to rebel, and sent over divers Bulls to that purpose.*

## CHAP. III.

### *Doctrines and Principles of the Roman Church,*

1. *The Doctrine of Deposing Princes. This is the Doctrine of all the approved Writers of that Church; Of their General Councils, of their Publique Offices and Breviaries. An Account of those persons who have appear'd against the Deposing Doctrine.*
2. *The*

## The Contents.

2. *The King-killing Doctrine. It is a necessary consequent of the Deposing Doctrine. The Roman Divines equivocate in this Question. The Jesuites generally assert it; divers of the Popes and the Canon Law approve of it.*
3. *Of destroying mens Lives for Religion. The true State of the Question. The Church of Rome damns all Heretiques. All Protestants are Heretiques in her account. She enjoyns all Christians to endeavour the Extirpation of them. All Bishops of her Communion sworn to destroy them. The Laws of the Church deliver them up to the Secular Power to be put to death.*
4. *Of absolving his Majesties Subjects from their Allegiance.*

## CHAP. IV.

*Testimonies of the Loyalty of the Roman Church and Religion, considered.*

*The first from St. Math. 22. 21.*

*The second from the Decree of the General Council of Constance.*

*The*

## The Contents.

*The third from the Annotations of the Divines of Rhemes, on Rom. 13.*

*The fourth, from the Censure of the Doctors of the Faculty of Sorbon, against a Book of Sanctarelus.*

## CHAP. V.

*The Fifth Testimony of the Loyalty of the Roman Church from a late Treatise of a Romish Priest.*

*The Principles of that Treatise examined.*

*Of the Principles and Authority of the General Councils of that Church.*

*Of licensing men to lie and forswear themselves.*

*Of the Doctrine of Equivocation and mental Reservation; with a brief Account of the Propositions lately censured at Rome.*

*Of the Simplicity and Godly Sincerity of the Roman Church.*

*Of the Design of dividing the Papists.*

*Of the Distinction between the Church and the Court of Rome;  
the*

## The Contents.

*the grounds of that Distinction  
examined and confuted,  
Of Dispensations, &c.*

### CHAP. VI.

*Of the late Lord Staffords Decla-  
ration and Address to the House  
of Peers, concerning a Compre-  
hension for the Dissenting Prote-  
stants, and a Toleration for the  
Papists.*

*1. Of the Comprehension for the Dis-  
senting Protestants.*

*Three Propositions concerning Com-  
prehension.*

*'Tis neither the Duty nor Interest of  
any Roman Catholicks (continu-  
ing true to their Principles) to  
promote a firm and lasting Union  
of Protestants.*

*What Influence the Romish Agents  
had on the first Separation from  
our Church.*

*Of the late Declaration of Indul-  
gence.*

*2. Of the Toleration for the Papists.*

*Of their endeavours to procure a  
Toleration under Queen Eliza-  
beth, King James, King Charles  
the*

## The Contents.

*the First, the late Usurped Powers, and his present Majesty. What the Design of that Faction is in endeavouring to procure a Toleration.*

*They have been the worse for Favour and Indulgence, as is evident from their Behaviour towards Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, and his present Majesty.*

*This Chapter concluded with the Protestation of King Charles the First.*

## CHAP. VII.

*A short Reflection on the foregoing Discourse.*

*Some things offered to all such as desire to prevent the Designs of the Papists.*

*1. Beware of Seditious Doctrines and Practises.*

*A brief Account of them.*

*This Consideration recommended to all Protestants; especially to the Dissenters from the Established Church of England.*

*Of the Secluded Members; and of  
the*

## **The Contents.**

- the Solemn League and Covenant.*  
2. *Beware of being Instrumental to  
the weakning or subverting of the  
Church of England.*  
*Popery can never enter into our  
Church so long as the Establisht  
Articles, Liturgy and Govern-  
ment are maintained.*  
*The Difference between the Cere-  
monies of the Church of Rome and  
those of the Church of England.*  
*Three Considerations to them that  
charge our Church and Episcopal  
Clergy with Inclining to Popery.*  
*Some other things propounded to the  
Dissenters by way of Considera-  
tion and Advice.*  
*The Conclusion of the whole.*
-

## CHAP. I.

*The Principles of the Roman Church and Religion destructive of Piety and Vertue. Three Cases wherein it is possible for R. Catholiques to be better than their Religion inclines or allows them to be. Of the Principles and Practises of his Majesties R. Catholique Subjects in the time of the late Rebellion. Of their Rebellion in Ireland; and the Advantage which the Kings Enemies in England made of it. Since his Majesties Restauration they refused to give him any reasonable security of their Allegiance for the future. Many Papists actually in Arms against King Charles the First in England; many others did him no Service: Upon what Motives the rest adhered to him. A Consult of the English Jesuits about taking away his Life. Of the Principles and Behaviour of the R. Catholiques*

*liques under the Usurped Powers:  
Of Mr. White's Book.*

**T**He ensuing Treatise is not intended for those weak and credulous persons, that suffer themselves to be charmed with specious Titles and flattering Prefaces; and therefore without any reflection on our Author's Arts of Insinuation, I shall come to the Matter of the Book called (by an odd kind of Antiphrasis) *A Brief and Impartial Account*, &c. So far as it falls within the Compass of my Design.

The former Part of the Book is for the most part made up of Allegations in proof of the Plot in general, and Reflections on the Depositions; The Process against the late Lord *Stafford* in particular, with the Evidence against him and his Lordships Exceptions, the Observations of the Managers of the Tryal and the Papists Answers to them; the Consideration of all which I leave to others.

But that I may not seem to pass over any thing, which looks like a Proof of the Loyalty and Peaceableness of the *Roman* Church, or of his Majesties *Roman* Catholique Subjects, I shall fairly set down all such Passages as are material to that purpose.

*Staffords*



Staffords Memoires, p. 2.

[His Lordship was ever held to be of a generous disposition, very Charitable, Devout, addicted to Sobriety, inoffensive in his Words, and a Lover of Justice. During the time of the last bloody Rebellion, he suffered much for his Loyalty to the King.]

Of the Popish Plot he saith ;

[p. 8. This Plot must be managed by persons of Quality, most remarkable peradventure of all others for firmness of Loyalty.]

Again, [The whole Body of Roman Catholiques (men before this hour of known worth, vertue, integrity and unblemished Reputation) must all be involved by Vows and Sacraments in a Design so black and execrable, that God and Nature abhor to think on.]

[p. 52. Certain I am Catholiques (Roman Catholiques he means) both taught and practised Principles of Loyalty, at a time, when the King and Kingdom felt the dire Effects of contrary Persuasions.]

That I may proceed with all possible clearness in my Answer to these bold Assertions, I shall reduce what I have to say to two Debates.

I. Concerning the Piety and Vertue of Roman Catholiques.

II. Concerning their Principles and Practices in the time of the late Rebellion.

1. I begin with the Piety and Vertue of Roman Catholiques.

That the Principles of the Roman Church and Religion do naturally tend to make men wicked and disloyal, I shall prove in the following Discourse. And yet I freely grant, That some men of that Communion may have a great and just Sense of their own Honour, and that Duty which they owe to their King and Country: They may be better Men, and better Subjects, than the Principles of their Church and Religion do either incline or allow them to be.

This may come to pass any of these three ways.

1. When they do not understand the Sense of the Roman Church, or the natural tendency of the Principles of their Religion, for the Confessors and Guides of Souls (which have the Faith and Consciences of the Laity in their keeping) do not think fit at all times and in all places to instruct their Disciples in such Doctrines.

2. When their natural Tempers and Dispositions are stronger than the Principles of their Church and Religion. For I do not think the worst Religion in the World can root out all common Reason and natural Conscience, all good Nature and Humanity, and make all men Bloody and Disloyal, whom Nature hath made Kind

Kind and Peaceable. Some men have more of the Generosity of the *English* Man, than of the Treachery of the Papist; the very names of Murder and Treason strike a kind of Horror into the minds of men, and natural Conscience (if it be not bribed or biassed by a bad Religion or a vicious Life) will startle at the thoughts of Assassinations and Rebellions, the violation of Oaths and Contracts.

3. When they have not much Zeal for Religion. For if men be cool and indifferent in that Religion which they profess, they may be over-ballanced with the Love of their King and Country.

And yet after all no man knows, just how much ignorance, good-nature or indifference in Religion, will serve to balance the Fury of a misguided Zeal.

II. I come to consider the Principles and Practices of the *Roman* Catholiques in the time of the late Rebellion.

And though I would not lessen the Services which some persons of that Religion have done to his Majesty, or Royal Father of Blessed Memory; yet I must say there are many things which overthrow all the Pretences of Loyalty to the Crown that are made by the main Body of *Roman* Catholiques.

That this is no uncharitable Surmise will appear if we look back as far as the

*Irish* Rebellion, wherein the *Roman* Catholics of that Kingdom were almost universally engaged.

I know the Seditious Practices of such as called themselves Protestants were by so much the more inexcusable, by how much Protestant Principles are more inconsistent with Religion, than these of the Papists. But the Tumults in *Scotland* were now in a great measure suppressed, and the King had by some Acts of Grace, and Additions of Honour to the Malecontents of that Kingdom quieted, if not obliged his Enemies, when he was surprized with the news of a desperate Rebellion and barbarous Massacre of many thousand Protestants in *Ireland*. And as his Majesties Affairs were hereby put into a much worse condition than before, so the Parliament in *England* became more unreasonable in their Demands, more resolute in their Answers, than otherwise they either would or durst have been. For the King conjures them by all that is or can be dear to them or him, to take into consideration the case of his distressed Protestant Subjects; but (to use his Majesties own Words;) *The Distractions and Jealousies here in England made most men rather intent to their own Safety, or Designs they were driving, than to the Relief of those, who were every day inhumanely butcher'd in Ireland.* (A)

(A) Ἐκδων  
 βασιλική, printed 1649. p.  
 92.

The Parliament in *England* pass a Vote,  
That the Kingdom be forthwith put into  
a posture of Defence; and soon after an-  
other, That the Ordinance for the De-  
fence of the Kingdom is not prejudicial to  
the Oath of Allegiance. They Vote,  
That what was done at *York* for a Guard  
to the King, was a Preparation for War  
against the Parliament, a breach of the  
Trust reposed in him by his People, &c. 1641 & 1642  
(B) *Memorials of the English Affairs printed 1682. ad an.*

But to return to *Ireland*, Here was a  
Plot and Design against the Crown and  
Government, of which his Majesty ex-  
pressed the greatest Abhorrence, and De-  
testation, and offer'd to go in Person to  
reduce the Rebels to Obedience: A Plot  
in which the main Body of the Papists,  
and no others were actually concerned.  
(C) *In the Preamble to the Bill of Settlement in Ireland an. 1662. it is called, An*

Unnatural Insurrection against his Majesties Royal Father, his  
Crown and Dignity, which first broke out *Octob. 23. 1641.* and  
afterwards spreading it self over the whole Kingdom, it became a  
formed and almost National Rebellion of the *Irish Papists*. And  
in an Act of Parliament for keeping the 23d. of *October* as an An-  
niversary Thanksgiving, it is said, That many malignant and re-  
bellious Papists, and Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other Super-  
stitious Orders of the Popish pretended Clergy, most disloyally,  
treacherously, and wickedly conspired to surprize the Castle and  
City of *Dublin*, and all other Cities, and Fortifications of that  
Realm; and that all Protestants and *English* throughout the whole  
Kingdom, which would not joyn with them, should be cut off,  
&c.

*See the late History of the Irish Rebellion in Folio.*

And F. *Walsh* in the Dedication of his History of the *Irish Remonstrance*, tells us of an Universal Rebellion or Insurrection of all the Catholiques in *Ireland*, a very few excepted, against his Majesties Laws, Authority, and Deputies of that Kingdom, *Ann.* 1641. Of their Confederacy formed, and a War continued by them for many years after; of two several Peaces (the first 1646. the second 1648.) with his Majesties Lord Lieutenant in that Interim, scandalously violated by the prevailing party among them.

Yea, to that prodigious height did the Insolence of the rebellious Faction arise, that at length they banished his Majesties Lieutenant, and took the Royal Authority upon themselves.

But it may be since his Majesties happy Restauration, they have repented of their former Wickedness.

Repented of a Rebellion that was Blessed and Sanctified by the Pope! A Catholique Army (for so they stiled themselves) repent of fighting for the Catholique Cause!

They were so far from repenting, that the Popish Clergy of that Kingdom assembled in a National Synod *Ann.* 1666. refused to petition the King for Pardon, though there were at least thirty then present, and above five hundred more of them

them alive, which were obnoxious to the Laws for their carriage during the late Wars of the *Roman Catholique Confederates*. (D) *History of the Irish Remonstrance, p. 667, 671, 672.*

Indeed since his Majesties Return, some of the *Irish* Clergy and Laity agreed to present such a *Remonstrance* to his Majesty, as might seem to give him some tolerable security of their Loyalty for the future. But the whole number of Ecclesiastical Subscribers was only Sixty nine; the Opposers being two thousand or thereabouts, besides all others in the *Irish* Colleges and Seminaries abroad: And of these few Subscribers some fell off immediately, upon the first intimation of displeasure from the Internuntio *De Vecchiis*, and their General Superiors beyond the Seas. (E) *History of the Irish Remonstrance, p. 577, 578.*

In England many *Roman Catholiques* were actually in Arms against King *Charles the First*; His Majesty himself (that had most reason to know) informs us, That great numbers of that Religion were entertained in the Army of the Rebels; that others were seduced, to whom he had formerly denied employment; that twenty or thirty at a time of one Troop or Company had been taken Prisoners. (F) *See His Majesties Declaration to all his loving Subjects in his Kingdom of Scotland.*

But were not many of the *Roman Catholiques* in the Kings Army? They were indeed; but not so many as his Enemies would

would make the World believe. His Majesty tells us in His Declaration, That sometimes in a Month together there had not been one Papist near his Court. I am sure he was not much beholden to them for their Company at any time ; His Majesty knew it was the Policy of his Enemies to hunt them into his Camp, that they might bring an *Odium* upon the Royal Cause, and confirm the People in that groundless Jealousie of the Kings adherence to Popery, which made him (by His Proclamation) to inhibit all men of that Religion to repair to Him : Besides we are told by one of the *Roman Church*, That 'tis a Maxim of the Jesuits (who have long bore the greatest sway in *England*) in the Quarrels of Princes and great Men, to have some of their Fathers on one part, and some for the contrary, that they may work for their own Interests on both sides. (G) And, (whatever boasts they now make of their Loyalty to the late King) we have not yet forgotten, how they pleaded to the late Usurpers, That for the Preservation of their Lives they were forced to flee into the Kings Garrisons without ever acting against the State. (H) That a great part of them were never in actual Arms against the Parliament, but only fled to the Enemies Garrisons for Shelter, &c. (I)

(G) *The Author of the Jesuits Reasons unreasonable, Printed 1662.*

(H) *The Christian Moderator, printed 1652. p. 60.*

(I) *Christian Moderator, p. 18*

But



But I have so much charity as to believe, that some Roman Catholiques offer'd their Lives and Fortunes to the King upon more generous Motives; that they served him faithfully and suffer'd for him, because (as a great Man of that Religion said of himself) *They valued the Favour and Esteem of their Country above all Earthly things; or were true English men as to this World.* (K)

(K) The Earl of Bristol in his Speech made July 1. 1673.

We have known some tempers that have conquer'd the malignity of Poyson; and some men have a greater love for their King and Country, than for their Priests and Confessors; some have too much honesty, and some too little zeal for Religion to be intrusted with the State-Mysteries of Jesuits and Bigotted Papists. A reverend and learned Person of our Church hath divers times told the World in print, (L) That there was a Consult in England of the whole Faction of Jesuites about bringing his Sacred Majesty to the Block;

(L) Dr. Du Moulin Anf. to Philanax Anglicus p. 56. (Ed. 1679.)

This certain Intelligence shall be justified whensoever Authority will require it; that the year before the Kings death, a select number of English Jesuits were sent from their whole party in England, first to Paris, then to Rome with this Question in writing; That seeing the state of England was in a likely posture to change Government, whether it was lawful for the Catholiques to work that change, for the advancing and securing the Catholique Cause in England, by making away the King, whom there was no hope to turn from his Heresie? and p. 61. As for my being defied by the Papists, I have defied them now seventeen years, to call me in question before our Judges, and so I do still.

But

But what number of the Laity were privy to that execrable Design, we are not able to learn.

But if ever the *English* Papists had any reason to boast of their Obedience to the Government, it was under the late Usurped Powers: For they basely flatter'd the most Infamous Rump; (M) They publicly own'd them for the Supream Authority of the Nation, and pleaded the Merit of their Fidelity to them. And if generally to take, and punctually to keep the Engagement; if to flatter the great Tyrant; if to offer, that for a Toleration they would renounce the Interest of the *Stuarts*, be Arguments of firmness of Loyalty to the Crown, then I will grant, That the *Roman* Catholiques are the Kings Most Loyal and Dutiful Subjects.

(M) See the *Petition of the Roman Catholiques, to the Supream Authority of this Nation, the Parliament of the Common wealth of England. Christian Moderation.* p. 59, 60. p. 51. Divers Papists had taken the Oath

of Abjuration and Engagement, &c. Part 2. p. 41. The *Roman Catholiques* have generally taken and punctually kept the Engagement, &c. Dr. *Baily* in the *Life of B. Fisher* (as I find him quoted by Mr. *Fowles*) is very zealous in asserting the Loyalty of the Papists; and yet at the same time bravely tells us, what good Subjects they were to *O. Cromwel*: Whereas (saith he) all other Sorts and Sects (excepting those who are for all Sorts and Sects) appear against the present Government, like *Aries*, *Scorpio*, &c. the *Roman Catholiques* like *Pisces* (the Emblem of the Fisherman) are contented to remain quiet under Foot.

But I will conclude this Head with this Observation, That Mr. *White* in the height of *Olive's* Tyranny, set out a Book under the Title of *The Grounds of Obedience and Government*. This moderate *Roman Catholique*

tholique (as he is esteemed) labours not only to disengage the People of *England* from all Obligation to his present Majesty, (then in Exile) but his Majesty too from laying any further claim to his Crown ; but (blessed be God) the King was restored to his Government, to which his *Roman* Catholique Subjects (according to this Gentleman) ought not to endeavour his Restitution.

---

## CHAP.

... (as he is affected) in our not  
only to discuss the People of England  
from all Opposition to his present Mis-  
ty (then called) but his Majesty too  
from laying any further claim to his  
Crown; but (as he is) the King  
was called to the Government to which  
the former (as he is) subject (according  
to this Government) ought to under-  
stand his Majesty.

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

*The Treasons and Seditions in other Countries, especially the Bloody Wars in England, and the Murder of King Charles the First charged upon the Protestants. The Reformed Churches abroad, and the Church of England vindicated from this Imputation. The King brought to the Block by a prevailing Faction against the Consent of the Nobility and People of England. The Romish Faction had a great Influence on the beginning and progress of the Rebellion. The Troubles in Scotland fomented by Cardinal Richlieu's Agents. The Letter of the Scotch Covenanters to the French King. The Design of the Papists against the King discover'd Ann. 1640. What Influence they had on the War which followed in England, and upon the Kings death. Two Propositions added to the foregoing Discourse. 1. That the Grounds on which the War against the King*

*was*

was justified were first laid by the prevailing Faction of the Roman Church. This Proposition proved from Gregory 1. Zachary, Gregory the 7th. &c. From Parsons, Creswel, Suarez, Bellarmine, Bouchier, Mariana, Fr. de Verone, Reynolds. They which have written in defence of the War, or of the Kings death go upon the same Principles. 2. That in the Reign of King Charles the First, the Pope animated his Subjects to rebel, and sent over divers Bulls to that purpose.

(A) This refers to the printed Tryal of the late Lord Stafford p.9.

Staffords Memoires p. 12, 13. [ 'To the  
 ' Instances given of Popish Malice and  
 ' Bloodiness ( A ) from former Examples, he  
 ' answers, That by the same reason and to as  
 ' good purpose the traitorous Seditions and  
 ' Outrages in Germany, France, Bohemia,  
 ' and Holland, authorized and fomented by  
 ' Calvin, Zuinglius, Beza, and other Re-  
 ' formers; the late bloody Wars in England,  
 ' the almost yesterdays Remonstrances and Fra-  
 ' ctises in Scotland; but above all that ne-  
 ' ver to be paralleld hellish Murder of the  
 ' Lords Anointed, our Glorious Sovereign  
 ' Charles the First, in cold blood, by out-  
 ' ward form of Justice, on pretence of Refor-  
 ' mation, might be imputed to the Protestant  
 ' Religion

' Religion ; for all these horrid Villanies were  
 ' committed by Protestants ; Protestants who  
 ' gloried in being more than ordinarily refined  
 ' from Popish Errors and Superstitions. If it  
 ' be said (as most justly it may) the Church  
 ' of England never taught such Practises,  
 ' the same say and protest the Papists in behalf  
 ' of their Church. ]

Let this Author bestow as hard names  
 as he pleases upon the Contrivers and Ac-  
 tors in these horrid Villanies ; and let  
 that Religion, (if so wicked a thing must  
 be called Religion) which gave encour-  
 agement to them, go (as it deserves)  
 for Infidelity and Irreligion. I am sure  
 there are no greater Enemies to the Chri-  
 stian Religion, than those which endea-  
 vour to pretend to promote it by such  
 ways as are contrary to the very Nature  
 and Design of all true Religion.

Indeed our Adversaries of the *ROMAN*  
 Communion lay as bad things to the  
 charge of the Protestants, as we can do  
 to their Church and Religion ; and as of-  
 ten as we put them in mind of the Fifth  
 of *November*, they are ready to reproach  
 us with the Thirtieth of *JANUARY*. And  
 that I may not make any cause or persons  
 look either better or worse than they are,  
 I shall make a faithful representation of  
 the Doctrines and Practises of both sides,

so far as they are pertinent to the present Debate, viz.

Whether the traiterous Seditions and Outrages in *England* and other Parts of Christendom may be imputed to the Protestant Religion, with as much reason, as the Instances of Popish Malice and Bloodyness from former Examples may be to the *Roman Church* and Religion?

Some years ago was published a Seditious Libel under the Title of *Philanax Anglicus*, wherein the Author taxes not only some Protestant Reformers, but the very Reformation it self with Rebellion; charges the English Reformers with Treason against Queen *Mary*; and (with a *Roman* boldness) asserts, That the Seditious Doctrines are allow'd by the generality of them that call themselves Protestants. But this Book having had a solid and substantial Answer by Dr. *Du Moulin*, I will not trouble my self or the Reader with any thing which he hath written in vindication of the Protestant Religion, and the Reformed Churches and Divines abroad. But I cannot but take notice of the Ignorance or rather the Malice of the Author of the *Controversial Letters*, (out of whom the substance of the present imputation is taken) who tells us, He doth not know that the Church of *England* hath proceeded so far as the *Roman Church* hath done



done in the Council of *Constance*, or condemned those Errors by any Authentick Censures. And our Author is not afraid or ashamed to say, that some *Roman Catholics* are *most remarkable* peradventure of all others for firmness of Loyalty.

I shall endeavour therefore, with as much brevity as the Subject will allow, to vindicate the Honour of the Reformation of our own Church and Nation from this unjust and malicious Charge.

I. The Confessions of the several Reformed Churches abroad are so full and clear in asserting the Obedience of Subjects to their Princes, that I do not find our Adversaries of *Rome* have much to say against them. (B) And 'tis observable, That upon the reprinting of all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches at *Geneva* *An. 1654.* it was moved, That instead of the *39 Articles* of the Church of *England* (which do with the greatest plainness and sincerity assert the Duty of Subjects to Princes) they would insert the Confession of the Assembly of Divines,

(B) *V. Corpus & Syntagma Confessionum, Sec. Aurel. Allob. 1662: V.G. The Bohemian, the Helvetian, the French, the Augustine, the Saxon, the Belgick Confession.*

ons, in the Articles concerning the Civil Powers. We are told that the Protestants of *France*, had towards the beginning of the War, resolved upon a Declaration, against the Parliament and Subjects of *England* taking Arms against the King, and had published it, if it had not been dashed by Cardinal *Richlieu*. (C) *Englands Complaint* by *L. Gatford.* Printed 1648. pag 10.

(C) Dwell.  
vind. Eccles.  
Angl. c. 2.

but the motion was utterly rejected by the University, Senate, and Church of Geneva, and the 39 Articles put in as before. (C)

As to the Sayings of particular Doctors of the Reformation I cannot, indeed I need not defend them; they are no Pillars of our Faith, nor do their Writings bear the stamp of publick Authority. And since none of our Adversaries have proved, that any of the Reformed Churches have by any Authentick Act approved of Seditions and treasonable Principles (as I shall prove the *Roman Church* doth) they cannot be imputed to the Protestant Religion with the same reason, that we charge them upon the *Roman Church*. Let the Papists say and Protest, that their Church never taught any Seditious Practises, yet I shall sooner trust my own Senses, than such men as (by the Principles of their Religion) are under no Obligation of speaking Truth.

2. No Church under Heaven did ever more expressly declare against all Seditious and Disloyal Practises, than the Church of *England*.

Our Reformation was begun and carried on in a peaceable and legal manner; and our Reformers proposed to themselves that excellent Rule of our Saviour, *They restored to God the things that were Gods,*

*Gods, and to the Kings the full exercise of their lawful Power.*

We are Members of a Church whose just Glory it is not only to have constantly taught the Duty of Subjects to their Princes, but suffered for her Loyalty to them. Our Kings and the Church of *England* have always rejoiced and wept together; and none ever forsook the Royal Cause in its Distress, which had not first forsaken the Church, or at least lost all their Zeal and Affection to her.

In Fine, our late Royal Martyr declared, That he died for maintaining the true Protestant Religion; he acquitted not only the Church of *England*, but all the true Sons of the Church from the Guilt of his Blood, scarce any one of which (he said) had been a Beginner or an active Prosecutor of the War. If then by the Protestant Religion, our Author mean the Christian Religion as it is professed in the Church of *England*, or in the best reformed Churches abroad, his Charge is most unjust and malicious; if he mean any thing else by it, he might better have called it the Popish or Fanatick, than the Protestant Religion.

What a potent Faction of men, (which they may call Protestants, as they call themselves Catholiques) did in these Kingdoms, all men know: But of all men living the *Romanists* have the least reason to call them Traitors and Rebels, as I

shall shew afterwards. But though the King was arraigned in the name of the Commons of *England*, yet it was well observed by his Majesty at his Tryal, That they never asked the Question of the tenth man of the Kingdom, much less of the major part of the Nation: They had no consent of the House of Peers; the Ordinance for trying the King being rejected by the Lords. They were no free or full House of Commons; for that House being freed from the Insolence of the Army resolved upon a Treaty with his Majesty, recalled their Votes of *Non-Addresses*, and voted that he should be in Honour, freedom and safety. And after the major part of the House had voted the Kings Concessions to be a sufficient ground for Peace, the Army Officers seized and committed some of the Members as they were coming to the House, accused others of inviting the *Scots* the last Summer, and required that they might be excluded. Thus (many of the Commons being forced out, and others absenting themselves) they restored the Votes of *Non-Addresses*, and voted the drawing up a Charge of *Treason* against his Majesty. This is that Venerable Assembly (a mere unparliamentary Juncto) which in obedience to these Masters, damn'd all former Votes in Favour of the King, and brought him to the Block; against the Laws of the Kingdom, the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy,

premacý, the Sense of the Church of *England*, of the House of Peers, and of the greater part of the House of Commons.

But if we trace the Footsteps of this Rebellion as far as we can, it will appear that the *Romish* Faction had a great Influence both on the first Beginnings, and Progress of it. What is it that they have more maligned than the Government and Constitution of this Church and Kingdom? Or how could the *Roman* Conclave find out a safer (if not a quicker) way to ruin the Protestant Religion, than by breaking in pieces that Church which is the Strength and Beauty, that Kingdom whose Sovereign was (under God) the Defender of the Reformation?

It was the Judgment of Bishop *Bramhall*, That the Popes Privy Purse, and Subtle Councils helped to kindle our Civil Wars, which ended in the Tragical Murder of the Lords Anointed. The intemperate Heat of the Seditious Spirits in *Scotland* had fermented a great part of the Kingdom; but before they broke out into open Hostilities, they made secret Applications to Cardinal *Richlieu*, the great Minister of *France*, and Favourite of *Rome*, which made use of all his Interest and Policy to embroyl his Majesties Affairs in that Kingdom. This great

Statesman knowing that it was the Interest of *England* to hold the Ballance even between *France* and *Spain*, and that his Majesty had (in the year 35) hindred the *French* from making themselves Masters of the *Spanish Neiberlands*, resolved to blow the Coals in *Scotland*, and practise upon the Male-contents, whom he found so well prepared for an Insurrection. To this purpose he sends *Chamberlain* a *Scot* to exasperate the Confederates against the King; appoints one of his Secretaries to reside among them, to be present in their Councils of War, and to direct their Proceedings; and some of the Covenanters had free access to *Con.* (the same Countryman) whilst *Chamberlain* was Negotiating for the Cardinal. This is certain, the Court of *Rome* and the *Jesuites* (those inveterate Enemies of our Religion and Government) could not have thought of a more effectual and easie Method to bring us to ruin, than by making us do their Work for them; and the Cardinal, who had formed those vast Designs of enlarging the *French* Monarchy, observing (if not raising) the Tumults in that Kingdom, laid hold of the Advantage, which men of ambitious and restless Spirits had put into his Hands.

Ann. 1639. came to light a Letter of the *Scotch Covenanters* written to the *French King*, wherein they desired his Protection, and Assistance. The Lord *Lowdon* being by the Kings Command examined about it, confessed it was his hand-writing, and that it was framed before the Pacification, which being agreed to, the Letter (he said) was never sent. (D) The late Author of the *Impartial Collection* hath furnished us with a more exact Discovery of the secret Influence, which those Foreign Councils and Assistances gave both to the *Scottish* Commotions and *English* Rebellion. The Letter to the *French King* is set down by him in *English*, (E) which I will here transcribe.

(D) *The Memoires of D. Hamilton. And The Memorials of the English Affairs, ad an. 1639.*

(E) *An Impartial Collection of the great Affairs of State, &c. vol. 1. Published 1682. p. 276, 277.*

SIR,

Y Our Majesty being the Refuge and Sanctuary of afflicted Princes and States, we have found it necessary to send this Gentleman Mr. Colvil, to represent to your Majesty the Candour and Ingenuity, as well of our Actions and Proceedings, as of our Intentions, which we desire to be engraved and written to the whole World, with a beam of the Sun, as well as to your Majesty; We therefore most humbly beseech you (Sir) to give Faith and Credit to him, and to all that he shall say on our part, touching us and our Affairs; being most assured (Sir) of an Assistance equal to your wonted Clemency heretofore, and so often shewed to this Nation

on

on, which will not yield the Glory to any other whatsoever to be eternally (Sir) your Majesties most Humble, most Obedient, and most Affectionate Servants.

Subscribed by divers of the Principal Covenanters.

At the Meeting of the Parliament in England Apr. 13. 1640. the Lord Keeper in his Speech to both Houses acquaints them ;

Since his Majesty came from Berwick, it came to his certain knowledge, That they (the Scots) have addrested themselves to Foreign States, and treated with them to deliver themselves up to their Protection and Power (as by Gods great Providence and Goodness, his gracious Majesty is able to shew under the Hands of the prime Ringleaders of that Faction) than which nothing could be of more dangerous consequence to this and his Majesties other Kingdoms. Whosoever they be that do, or shall wish England ill, they may know it to be of too tough a complexion and courage to be assailed in the Face, or to be set upon at the Fore-door ; and therefore it is not unlikely, but they may (as in former times) find out a Postern-Gate.

After



After his Speech was ended, the King produced the Original Letter, which he intercepted as it was going to the French King; and ordered it to be read. (F) *Impartial Collections,* P. 309, &c.

As to the later Insurrections in Scotland, I will only observe, That besides the Information of some *Romish* Priests, being sent thither to prepare them for a Rebellion, their very Declaration shews, they were acted by a Popish Spirit; for the Act of *Supremacy* was condemned, and the Kings Authority in Ecclesiastical Affairs call'd an *Usurping Power*.

But to return: So true were the *Romish* Emissaries to their good Qld Cause, that having set the factious Party to work in Scotland, they took advantage from that conjuncture to stir up a National Rebellion, and barbarous Massacre in Ireland; of which I have spoken already.

I cannot pass over the Conspiracy against the King in the Year 1640, because it gives some further light into the Designs of Cardinal *Richilieu* and the Jesuites.

Whilst his Majesty resided at *Tork*, he was acquainted by the Archbishop of *Canterbury* with the Information he had received from Sir *W. Boswel*, his Majesty's Ambassadour at the *Hague*. By the discovery of this Plot it is evident, that the

*Jesu-*

*Jesuitical* Party exasperated the King and his Subjects one against another; labouring to incense his Majesty against them, as conspiring against his Crown and Government; and them against their Sovereign, as aiming at the subversion of their Laws, Liberties and Religion. That they stirred up the *Scots* to rebel, hindred all accommodation between the King and them, and endeavoured to bring his Majesty under a necessity of craving the Assistance of the *Papists*, which he should neither obtain without yielding to their own terms, nor refuse without the hazard of his life: That for the compassing of their Ends *Cardinal Barbarino* was engaged, fifty *Scotch Jesuites* were maintain'd in *London*, *Cuneus* in quality of the Popes Legate, Chamberlain, Chaplain and Almoner to *Cardinal Richlieu*, *Sir T. Matthew* a Jesuited Priest, *Captain Read* a Secular Jesuite; and that all the *Papists* in *England* did contribute to the carrying on the design.

Here was a Plot against the King and Kingdom, and Protestant Religion; of which he that desires a full account, may consult *Mr. H. Lestrange* and *Mr. Sanderson* in their Histories, *Prinn's Romes* Master-piece, and others of later time.

What

What great numbers of Priests, Jesuites, and other *Romish* Agents afterwards flocked into *England*; what various shapes they assumed, how they insinuated into the Councils and Armies of the Kings Enemies; Mr. *Gasford*, *Prinn*, *Dr. du Moulin*, and others informs us, to whom I refer the Reader. And even some of the Members in the Long Parliament were sensible, how active our Enemies of *Rome* had been in raising and fomenting the War; as we learn from a late Writer, who sat in that Assembly. I will barely relate what he saith, without making any Collections or Inferences from his words:

*'The Parliament Vote, That which was  
'done at York for a Guard to the King, to  
'be a preparation for War against the Par-  
'liament, a breach of the Trust reposed in  
'him by his People, contrary to his Oath, and  
'tending to the dissolution of his Govern-  
'ment; and all such as serve him there, to  
'be Traitors to the Laws of the Kingdom.*

Upon the debate for raising an Army, one of the Members declared his sense:

*'Our Enemies of the Popish Church have  
'left no Evil Arts unessayed to bring us to  
'our present posture, and will yet leave none  
'unattempted to make our breaches wider;  
'well knowing, that nothing will more advance  
'their Empire, than our Divisions. Our  
'Misery, whom they account Hereticks, is  
'their Joy, and our Distractions will be  
'their*

(A) Memorials of the English Affairs. ad An. 1642. 'their Glory; and all Evil arts and ways, to bring Calamities upon us, they will esteem Meritorious. (A)

Sanderus de Schism. Angl. (1585) p. 188. Quo Hereticorum (ut fit) bello, Catholici indies plures constantioresque in fide fiunt.

Campanella de Mon. Hisp. (Amst. 1641.) p. 204. Jam verò ad enervandos Anglos nihil tam conducit, quam dissensio & discordia inter illos excitata, perpetuòque nutrita, quod cito occasiones meliores suppeditabit.

P. 207. Verum ab alia parte instiget primores Comitiorum, aut Parliamenti, ut Angliam in formam reipublice reducant.

(B) Hist. of Indep. p. 114, 115.

Nor did the design of Cardinal Rich-  
lieu die with him; it was vigorously pur-  
sued by *Mazarine*, to whom he left his  
Instructions at his death; and what an  
intimate Correspondence was maintain'd  
between him and the Grandees of *Derby-  
House*, we are told by the Author of the  
History of *Independency* (B). His words  
are these: 'To negotiate which (the de-  
'taining of the Prince in France) the Gran-  
'dees of *Derby-House*, and the Army, have  
'an Agent lying Lieger with Cardinal Ma-  
'zarine (the great French Instrument of  
'State) who is so well supplied with Mo-  
'ney, and so open handed, that it hath been  
'heard from Mazarines own Mouth; That  
'all the Money the Queen and Prince have  
'cost the Crown of France, hath come out  
'of the Parliaments Purse with a good ad-  
'vantage. It is likewise said, Mazarine  
'hath an Agent here, to drive on the Interests  
'of France in England.

To

To all which we may add, That the King having assented (in the Isle of Wight) to pass five strict Bills against Popery, the Jesuites in France, at a General Meeting there, resolved to bring him to Justice, by the power of their Friends in the Army. And this resolution of the Fathers was agreeable to the sense of the Roman Conclave. 'For the Question being sent to Rome from the whole Party of Jesuites in England (the year before the Kings death;) whether, considering the present posture of Affairs, it was lawful for the Catholicks to work a change in the Government, by making away the King, whom there was no hope to turn from his Heresie? It was answered affirmatively. (C)

(C) Answer to  
Philanax An-  
glicus, p. 59,  
& 65.

To what I have said upon this Argument, I will add these two Propositions:

I. That the grounds on which the War against the King was maintain'd, (so far as it was maintained under a colour of Religion) were laid by the prevailing Faction of the Roman Church; and the most dreadful effects of Fanaticism, which were the consequents of it, may be justified by their Principles.

And here I could make it evident, That the same Maxims of Political Divinity, the same Arguments, and many times the same Phrases and Expressions,  
are

are to be found in the heads of both Fa-  
 ctions. I know it is disputed, whether  
 the King-leaders of Sedition amongst us  
 poysoned the Jesuites, or the Jesuites them;  
 but I do not envy the Bishops of *Rome*  
 the honour of having first poysoned  
 them both with Antimonarchical Do-  
 ctrines. If *Milton* (the great Oracle of  
 one of the Factions) had owned himself  
 to be a Papist, there had been no reason  
 to wonder at the Impiety of his Do-  
 ctrines, which he either did, or might  
 have learned from the Popes and greatest  
 Divines of the *Roman Church*. It was  
 truly alledged by *Salmasius*, that the Do-  
 ctrine of the Sacred and inviolable Au-  
 thority of Princes was preserved pure  
 and uncorrupt in the Church, till the  
 Bishops of *Rome* attempted to set up a  
 Kingdom in this World paramount to all  
 Kings and Emperours. But he, with his  
 usual confidence, acquits the Popes, and  
 charges his Antimonarchical Principles on  
*Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Bucer, Marryr,*  
*Paraus*, and all the Reformed Di-  
 vines. (D)

(D) Pro po-  
 pulo Anglicano  
 defensio, p. 33.

*Quot sunt Ecclesie Reformatae praestantissimi Doctores, tot videt aceri-  
 mos sibi adversarios fore, — frustra id in Papam deonerare atque trans-  
 ferre contendis, quod omnes liberae Nationes, omnis Religio, omnes Or-  
 thodoxi sibi sumunt, in se suscipiunt.*

I might

I might oppose to the Authority of *Milton* a very late Author of the *Roman Church*, who was well acquainted with the Doctrine of it. A reverend and learned Divine of our Church charged this Seditious Principle on the Jesuites; that Government is so originally in the People, that they by their Representatives may call their Sovereign to an Account, and alter the Form of the Government; he returns this Answer, That '*this Principle (whatsoever truth it may have in speculation) is by no means to be preached to the People, who are apt enough of themselves to stretch Cases, and pick Quarrels with their best Governours; yet it was taught many Ages before the Jesuites were so much as thought of.*' (E.

(E) Answer  
to several late  
Treatises (in

the Preface) *Ed. 2. 1674. By Dr. Stillingfleet.*

And this was the Fundamental Principle of the Seditious Spirits in *Scotland*, at the first beginning of the Trouble, viz. That all Authority is Originally in the Collective Body, derived from thence to the Prince; and that not only in case of negligence it is Suppletive in the Collective Body, as being Communicate from the Commonalty to the King, Cumulative not Privative; but also in case of Male-administration, to return to the Collective Body; so that *Rex excidit jure suo*, and that they may refuse Obedience.

See the Declinator of the Bishops of *Scotland* against the pretended General Assembly holden at *Glasgow. Novemb. 21. 1638.*

It seems the Doctrine is true, and hath been taught for many Ages in the *Roman Church*, but the People are not fit to have the management of it.

D

This

This latter part of his Assertion I could make good ; but because I study brevity, I shall only set down the Principal Heads of Antimonarchical Divinity as I find them in the Writings of some of the Popes, which lived divers Ages before the rise of the Jesuites.

(F) S. Gregorii  
Magni Opera  
Parisii 1619.

c 11. Ep. 38.

*Gloria in excelsis Deo, qui, iuxta quod scriptum est, mutat tempora & transfert regna; et qui hoc cunctis innotuit, quod per prophetam suum loqui dignatus est, dicens, quia dominatur excelsis in regno hominum, et cui voluerit ipse dat illud — aliquando cum misericors Deus merentium multorum corda sua decrevit collatione refovere, unum ad regiminis culmen prouehit, per cuius misericordie viscera in cunctorum mentibus exultationis sue gratiam infundit. De qua exultationis abundantia roborari nos citius credimus, qui benignitatem vestrae pietatis ad imperiale fastigium pervenisse gaudemus. Latentur caeli & exultet terra; &c.*

I. I begin with *Gregory* the first, who lived above a thousand years since. The Story of *Phocas* (one of the greatest Villains and Rebels in the World) is well known. This man from a Centurion became the Ringleader of a Rebellion against *Mauritius*, (his Sovereign Lord) caused the Emperors Children, the Heir Apparent to the Crown, divers of the Loyal Nobility, and the Emperor himself to be put to death; and yet he was no sooner gotten into the Imperial Throne; but Pope *Gregory* writes an Epistle to him, wherein he basely and perfidiously courts the Tyrant; congratulates his Success in the same words the Angels did our Saviours Nativity; blesses God, and admires the Divine Providence in exalting him to the Empire. This canting flattering Letter might with a little variation have served for an Address to any late Usurpers. (F)



2. The next is *Zachary*, that (about 900 years ago) deposed *Childerick* the French King, and absolved his Subjects from their Allegiance, not so much for his Iniquities, as because he was not fit to Govern. And this is attested by divers (G) *Decret.*  
 Authors of good Credit, and by their own *Par. 2. Caus. 15.*  
 Authentick Canon-Law ; ( G ) However *qu. 6. c. 4.*  
*Milton* pretends there was no need of a Pope, the King by his perfidiousness having discharged the people from their Oath made to him. (H) But *Milton* (H) *Pro pop.*  
 and others of better credit acknowledge *Angl. dis. c. 4.*  
 as much as is sufficient to my present purpose ; That the Pope declared it was the Peoples right to make and unmake their Kings ; and that he should be King which was fittest to discharge that Trust.

The Nobility of *France* were sensible (say their Historians) of the Kings idleness and unfitness to Govern, and of the great Vertue of *Pipin* ; and upon *Pipin's* consulting the Pope what was fit to be done in this case, his Determination was, that *He should be King, who was fittest to discharge the Office of a King* ; Whereupon the Nobility and People in a full Assembly depose *Childerick*, and choose *Pepin*.

Thus the People of *France* (with the Popes Consent and Advice) took off the Crown from their Kings Head, gave it to one of his own Subjects, and changed the Kingdom from one Family to another.

(1) Greg. 7. Ep.

l. 8. Ep. 21. I-  
tane dignitas à  
secularibus eti-  
am Deum igno-  
rantibus inven-  
ta, non subjecit-  
tur ei dignita-  
ti, quam omni-  
potentis Dei  
providentia,  
Sec. quis nescit  
Reges & Du-  
ces ab iis habu-  
isse Principi-  
um, qui Deum  
ignorantes, su-  
perbia, rapinis,  
perfidia, homi-  
cidis, postremo  
universis penè  
sceleribus, mun-  
di principe dia-  
bolo videlicet  
agitante, super-  
pares scilicet ho-  
mines dominari  
cæca cupiditate  
& intolerabili  
presumptione  
affectaverint.

V. l. 2. Ep. 5. Ep.

13. Ep. 18.

l. 2. Ep. 10.

Also his famous  
Dictates publi-  
shed in a coun-  
cil at Rome are  
to be seen in  
Baronius An-

nal. Eccles. Tom. 11. ad An. 1076. sect. 31, 32, 33.

V. Baron. ad An. 1080. sect. 62, 63, 64, 65. ad an. 1073. sect. 73, 24.

And what unpardonable Crime was this poor King guilty of? What Acts of cruelty had he committed? Indeed there is no such thing laid to his Charge. Some say he was a good and religious King; others that he was a good natur'd and easie Prince. His Enemies say he was not fit to govern; and this is the principal reason which the Canon-Law gives for his being deposed. It may be he was not so wise as some of his Neighbours; I am sure he was not so Crafty as his Holiness at Rome, or his own Subjects at home.

3. I challenge any man to shew me a more pernicious Account of the rise of Kingly Government, than is to be seen in Gregory the seventh that lived about six hundred years since. *'The Kings and Princes of the Earth, were at first no better than other Mortals; but by the Instigation of the Devil, by Pride, Rapine, Perfidiousness, Murder, intolerable Presumption, and all manner of Wickedness, they got the Power into their hands. Rare Divinity for the Head of the Church! But had his Holiness put in Popes instead of Kings, he had not been much out either in his Divinity or History. He that has a mind to see any more such wicked stuff, may consult the places quoted in the Mar-* gent. (1)

Kingly

Kingly Government (in his Judgment) is nothing else but the contrivance of evil Spirits to abridge men of that Liberty which God and Nature have given them; and if so, what we call Rebellion is a very harmless (if not a meritorious) thing. For why should not the People endeavour to recover their ancient Rights and Liberties which were so unjustly taken from them?

*Miltons* Inference from such Premisses is this:

*‘If it were my happiness to set free the  
‘Minds of Englishmen from longing to re-  
‘turn under the Captivity of Kings, from  
‘which the Strength and Supream Sword of  
‘Justice hath delivered them, I shall have  
‘done a Work not much inferiour from that of  
‘Zorobabel. (L)*

(L) *Iconoclasts*  
flies towards  
the latter end.

And now I cannot shew (without exceeding my intended brevity) how true the other Popes have been to these Principles *V. G.* in the 9th. Century *Adrian* the Second salutes the Pious and Orthodox *Basilius*, (that’s the Roman Catholique Title for Traytors) and congratulates the Murder of his Sovereign Prince.

About the 1090th. year *Urban* the second sate in the Holy See, of whom I need say no more, than that he was the Author of that Impious Decree, *That an Oath made to an Excommunicate Person is not to be kept.*

His Successor *Paschal* the Second commanded the Son of *Henry* the 4<sup>th</sup>, to take up Arms against his Father.

*Alexander* the Third (which lived in the same Century) trod upon the Neck of the Emperor.

The Decrees of *Innocent* the Third and Fourth are well known.

But I am not writing an History of the Bishops of *Rome*.

Since the rise of *Jesuites* the *Roman Catholics* in *France* entred into a clandestine Combination (the *Holy League* they call'd it) without their Kings Consent, under a colour of opposing the Progress of Heresie, but in truth to reduce the Catholique Forces into one Body, and strip the King of his Royalty. And how specious soever the Design of it might appear to some men of more Zeal than Judgment, yet in its very Nature and Tendency, it was of most fatal Consequence to the King and Government; and being prosecuted with Force and Armes against *Henry* the Third and Fourth, it cost one of them his Life and the other his Religion.

The Principal Instrument of the League was *Mathew* a Jesuite; and the Fathers of that Order would give no Absolution to the Gentry of *France*, unless they would vow and promise to band themselves against their Sovereign. The secret Counsels

sels and Conspiracies were holden in the Jesuites College; Where did the Agents and Ambassadors of Spain, the two Cardinals that termed themselves Legates in France assemble their Counsels, but among the Jesuites? Was not the Provincial of the Jesuites sent to Rome, and Father Sammier into Spain; where they acquitted themselves so well, that both Gregory the 13th. and the King of Spain promised large Sums of Money for carrying on the War? In Fine, the Holy League, and the War of Subjects against their Kings in prosecution of it, were promoted by Pope Gregory the 13th. Sixtus the 5th. Gregory the 14th. Innocent the 9th. &c. by the Jesuites and most of the Preachers and Confessors of all Orders; who soon drew in the main Body of the Papists into this Combination against Henry the Third, a King of their own Religion; but unjustly suspected to be Hæretically affected.

The Design of this Holy League may be seen in Tbuanus l. 63. Ed. Geneva p. 164. &c. more largely in Davila's History of the Civil Wars of France, ad An. 1576. &c. out of whom I will transcribe part of it.

Art. 2. 'For preservation of the King and  
'his Successors in the State, Honour, Authority,  
'Duty, Due to them by their Subjects,  
'as it is contained in those Articles which  
'shall be presented to him in the Assembly of  
'the States, &c.

Art. 4. and 5. ' If there be any Impediment, Opposition, or Rebellion, be it from whom it will, or from whencesoever it may, &c. In case any of the Covenanters be molested, oppressed or questioned for this Cause, be it by whom it will, (the King himself is not excepted) they shall employ their persons and goods, estates and lives to take revenge on them, either by Justice or Force, without any exception of persons whatsoever.

Art. 6. ' If any of the Confederates shall wilfully break this Promise and Oath, they shall be punished in Bodies and Goods, by all means that can be thought of, &c.

Art. 7. ' They shall swear to yield ready Obedience to the Head of the League, to the ruin of all Opposers of it without partiality or respect of persons.

Art. 8. ' All the Catholiques of all places shall be secretly advertised by their particular Governours, to enter into this League, and to concur in providing of Men, Arms, and other Necessaries.

Art. 10. ' All to be held as Enemies that will not enter into this Covenant.

It

It would be too large a digression to enter upon a Discourse concerning the Solemn League and Covenant in these Kingdomes ; and therefore I will only subjoyn the two following Observations, as a further Proof of the Loyalty and Peaceableness of the Reformed Churches abroad.

1. The first is that of his Majesty in his Excellent *Manifesto* (or late Declaration concerning the late Tumults in Scotland, by the King An. 1639. p. 74.)

'This Covenant was resented abroad by  
'Papists with infinite joy, in hopes it might  
'oblige the King and his Successors to have  
'the Protestant Religion for the sake of those  
'Seditious Zealots ; and the Priests and Jesuits  
'from Doway and other Seminaries,  
'came over in great numbers upon that Encouragement. But by Foreign Protestants  
'the Covenant was received with most offensive scandal and grief, (as his Majesties  
'Publick Ministers abroad gave him an account) for they were afraid it should bring  
'an indelible Scandal upon the Reformation, and alienate the minds of Princes  
'from it. Thus it became Joy and Triumph  
'to our Enemies, Grief and Scandal to our  
'Friends:

2. We

2. We are told, That the *English* Divines, and *Scotch* Commissioners, sent a Copy of their Covenant, with a solemn Invitation to Seventeen Reformed Churches beyond the Seas; but notwithstanding all the unjust Calumnies cast upon his Majesty, we never heard of any one Reformed Church that concurred with them in promoting it.

It is now time to come to the Principles of the *Jesuites*; and though I cannot find that the Divines and Casuists of other Orders are much more Honest and Loyal than they, yet I shall confine myself to them, because their Seditious and Treasonable Doctrines are maintain'd for the advancement of the Court of *Rome*, and by a particular influence from the Holy See. This is the richest, most learned and active of all the Orders of the *Roman* Church; they are under the strictest Vow of Obedience to the Pope; have had more ample Charters and Bulls of Priviledges, than all the other Orders; they are best qualified to dive into the Councils of Princes and Statesmen, and into the Consciences and Purfes of the People; they have almost devoured the Secular Clergy, worn out the other Orders, and engrossed the trade of hearing Confessions in *England* to their own Faction; and whensoever there hath been any dangerous Attempt upon our Church

or



or State, they were the principal Contrivers and Agents, the other Clergy is but their Tools and Instruments.

How much they have improved and refined these cursed Principles, I cannot inform the Reader without transcribing a great part of the Works of *Parsons, Creswel, Suarez, Bellarmine, Bouchier, Mariana, Fr. de Verone*, and others; out of almost any one of which, I could gather an entire Body of Commonwealth Divinity.

Nor can it be alledged, that these are only the Opinions of private Doctors, which are disowned by the Body of the Society; for their Books are perused and approved either by the General, or by other Superiours, or by the most eminent Divines, authorized and assigned by them. And is it not expressed in most of the Licenses, that there is nothing in them contrary to Faith or good Manners? That they are profitable for all Casuists and Guides of Souls?

But that this may appear to be no uncharitable imputation, I shall set down some of *Bellarmino's* Principles, and then refer you to the other Authors, as they are cited in the Margent; by which you may see, it is the glory of their Society, to be obliged to a perfect Uniformity in Doctrine. (M)

(N) V. *Constitutione Soc. Jesu. Const. — 42. Doctrina differentes non admittantur nec verbo in concionibus, vel lectionibus publicis, nec scriptis libris, qui quidem edi non poterant in lucem sine approbatione, & Consensu Praepositi Generalis.*

I. Then

1. Then, he informs you which is the best kind of Government. 'Let not the Presidents of Provinces be the Kings Deputies or Annual Judges, but true Princes; who may both be obedient to the Command of the chief Prince, and in the mean time govern their Province or City, not as if it were another Mans, but as their own: By this means both Monarchy and Aristocracy may have place in the Commonwealth. And if neither the Supream Prince, nor the Inferior Princes, acquire their Dignity by right of Succession, but by the Election of the People; this would be the best and most desirable form of Government (N). A form of Government more Democratical (by his own acknowledgment) than that of Venice. (O)

(M) Disput.

R. Bellarmini,

Lugduni 1610.

Tom. 1. de

R. Pontifice,

l. 1. c. 3. Regi-

mentemperatum ex omnibus tribus formis, &c.

(O) L. 1. c. 2. (p. 619.)

Respublica Venetorum est Aristocratia

admixta Monarchia.

2. 'The Power is in the whole Multitude, as in its proper Seat and Subject, and that by Divine right; and it dependeth on the consent and courtesie of the People, to set either Kings or Consuls, or other Magistrates over them; and if there be a lawful Cause, they may change the Government, and turn a Monarchy into an Aristocracy, as they please (N)

(P) De Laicis,

l. 3. c. 6. Sect.

Secundo nota,

& Quarto nota.

This

This he took to be the common Doctrine of their Divines; but afterwards finding that some had written against it, he comes to confirm it in the Recognition of his Works. And first, he proves it from *Aquinas, Dominicus à Soto, Navarre, &c.* then he confirms it by Experience: 'For (saith he) the City of Rome was first governed by Kings, then the People set up Consuls instead of them; which kind of Government was therefore esteemed just, because it seemed good to the People. Afterwards he commends the saying of *Navarre*, 'That the People do never so transfer their Power to a King, but they retain it habitually in themselves, and may in certain cases resume it into their own hands. Lastly, he proves from several Examples out of Scripture, 'That it belongs to the People to set a King over themselves. (Q)

(Q) Recognitio, l. 3. Quæstio de Laicis.

3. Kings are admitted to the Government under certain Conditions and Limitations, which if they transgress, the Subjects are discharged from all obligation of Obedience to them. 'Princes are received into the Church with an express or tacit Compact, That they shall submit their Scepters unto Christ, defend and preserve the Faith, under the penalty of forfeiting their Crowns; therefore if once they fall into Heresie, or become Enemies to Religion, they may be judged by the Church, and Deposed without any Injury to them. (R)

(R) De R. Pont. l. 5. c. 7. Sect. Quarta ratio.

4. It

4. It is lawful for the People, in certain Cases, to depose the King. In Temporal Commonwealths, if the King degenerate into a Tyrant; though he be the Head of the Kingdom, he may be deposed by the People, and another Elected. (S)

(S) De Concil.

Auctor. l. 2.

c. 19. Sect. Ad alteram consequentiam.

If you object, That the Primitive Christians did not depose Nero, Dioclesian, &c. he answers, 'They wanted strength; (they were bound to be subject for Wrath, but not for Conscience sake) for otherwise, they might lawfully have set up new Kings and Princes over them, as it is evident from 1 Cor. 6. (T)

(T) De R.

Pont. l. 5. c. 7.

Quod si Chri-

stiani olim non deposuerunt Neronem, &c. id fuit quia deerrant vires temporales Christianis. Id. de Excus. Barclaii.

If you urge those Texts of Scripture, which require Obedience to Kings and Princes: 'Tis true (saith the Cardinal) to disobey your King, is against the Law of God; but the Pope, when he deposes a King, doth not permit the People to disobey the King, but makes him that was their King to be a King no longer. (V)

(V) Idem in

Barclaium.

If you demand Precedents out of Scripture; Was not Uzziah deposed? 2 Chron.

26. Was not Athaliah deposed and put to death? 2 Chron. 23. (X)

(X) Id. de R.

Pont. l. 5. c. 8.

5. He makes the Civil Government to truckle under the Ecclesiastical: 'For the Civil Government is instituted by Men; but

' but the Church Government is from God  
' alone, and of Divine Institution. (Y)

' The Cognizance of Church Matters be-  
' longs not to Secular Princes, they have no  
' judgment in Ecclesiastical Matters; be-  
' cause Civil Peace and Tranquility is the  
' proper object of their Care.

' If they do not their duty, they are to be  
' brought under the Lash, and be compelled to  
' it by Excommunication.

' The Ecclesiastical Power is to the Secu-  
' lar, as the Spirit is to the flesh, which rules,  
' moderates, and sometimes restrains it; but  
' the Flesh hath no command over the Spirit,  
' neither can it direct, or judge, or restrain it  
' in any thing (A).

(Y) Id. de  
Laici, l. 3. c. 6.  
Sect. Quinto  
nota.  
Et de R. Pont.  
l. 1. c. 7. Sect.  
Præterea prin-  
cipatus, &c.

cum regimen penes Principes Seculares. Vid. l. 5. c. 7. & de Clericis.  
l. 1. c. 29. Sect. Alterum Argumentum, &c. Et Bellar. contra Bar-  
lainum.

(A) L. 1. c. 7.  
tit. Quod non  
sit Ecclesiasti-

6. Though the Cardinal hath not in  
express Terms asserted the lawfulness of  
putting Kings to death, (and I know  
very few of any Perswasion that have ex-  
pressly asserted it) yet he hath furnished  
the Regicides both with Precedents for  
their practice, and Warrants for their  
Doctrine. For he teaches, That the  
' Church may exercise a Coercive power over  
' Kings and Princes by any ways and me-  
' thods, that are necessary for the good of the  
' Church. That Kings may be Deposed;  
and there is no great difference (as I  
shall shew afterwards) between Deposin-  
and

and putting them to death. He proves his Doctrine from the practice of *Jehoiada* the High Priest, that commanded the Souldiers to put *Athaliah* to death, not only for Tyranny, but for adhering to a false Religion. (B)

(B) Id. de R.  
Pont. l. 5. c. 7, 8.

In his Book against King *James*, he commends the Murther committed by *J. Clement* on *Henry* the Third of *France*, calls the Regicide a *Sacred Person*, and admires the miraculous Providence of God in bringing him to death. (C)

(C) Bell. in  
Tort. p. 71.  
Ed. 1608.

*Deus ultus est Christum suum, dum per alium sacratum virum, alioqui militie imperitum & inermem, Regem eundem non sine manifesto divine Providentie miraculo interfecit.*

But what if Heaven will not work a Miracle for them? The Cardinal is so well skilled in the Art of *King-killing*, that he can dispatch a Prince with less hazard to his own Party. 'He would not have Ecclesiastical Men put them to death with their own hands; but the Pope must first admonish them, then deprive them of the Sacraments; next absolve their Subjects from the Oaths of Allegiance, and if need be, deprive them of their Royal Authority. The Execution belongs to others. (D)

(D) Id. contra  
Barclainum.

Thus I have given a short account of the *Antimonarchical* Principles of this great Man, that was first Reader of *Controversial Divinity* at *Rome*; afterwards

wards sent by Pope *Sextus* the Fifth into France, with his Legate Cardinal *Cajetan* where he stir'd up the People to a Rebellion against their Sovereign; (E) and was advanced to the dignity of a Cardinal by *Clement* the Eighth. (F)

(E) *Qui Intertia igit per illos annos publici furoris, totius conjura-*

*tionis (Ligam vocant) approbator, fautor, & fax perpetua. H. Casaubon ad Fr. Duc. Epistola, p. 21.*

(F) *Alegambe Bibl. Script. Soc. Jes. p. 410, 411.*

I might now shew, that these are the common Principles of the Society; but this would afford matter enough for an entire Discourse. (G)

(G) See *Parsons* (under the counter-

feit name of *Doleman*) in his Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, part 1.

*Creswel*, (under the name of *Philopater*) and *Reynolds* (under the name of *Rossary*) *De justa Christiana republica in Reges impios & haereticos auctoritate.* (He was no Jesuite, but of the same Principles.)

*Suarez* *Def. fid. Cath. &c.* A Book written against King *James*.

*Bouchier*, *de justa Men. 3. abd. è Francorum Regno.* A small Book, but almost every page is full of Treasonable Principles.

*Mariana de Rege & Regis Institutione; or (as some call it) Institutio principum occidentorum.*

*Fr. de Verone, Apol. pro J. Chastello,* (A Book, that if it be possible, outstrips *Mariana's* in Villany.)

To which I could add *Endem. Johannes, Molina, Lessius, Em. Sa, Greg. de Valentia, Tolet. &c.*

Whether *Junius Brutus* was a Protestant or no, is not certain; I find King *James* suspects the Book was set out by a Papist.

The Positions of *Knox* and *Buchanan* are summed up by *B. Bancroft*, in his dangerous Positions, l. 1. c. 4. The later Patrons of these Principles are well known.

E

These

These are the Men that furnish'd the leading Faction amongst us with Principles and Precedents, with Arguments and Texts of Scripture; as will appear to any one that compares the Books cited in the Margent, with the Speeches, Declarations and Pamphlets of the late Times. Out of them they either did, or might have derived the grounds of the War against the King, of erecting an High Court of Justice, and of bringing him to the Block. Out of them I could easily deduce all the Materials of that Bloody Ordinance, to erect an High Court of Justice for the Trial of the King; the Impeachment against his Majesty in the name of the Commons of *England*; the Speech of *Bradshaw*, President of that Mock-Court of Justice; and *Milton's* Vindication of the Proceedings against the King.

But because *Bellarmino* did not in express terms justify the putting of Kings to Death, I will add, That *Mariana* doth not only defend the lawfulness of a formal and aggressive War against a Sovereign Prince, but also sets down a Method of destroying him, either with, or without the Formality of Justice. His Book was written *An. 1599.* which was divers years after he had read *Tho. Aquinas* in the University of *Paris*. (H) It was approved by *Aquaviva*, the General of

(H) *Alegambt*,  
p. 258.



of the *Jesuites*, by *Hoyeda* Visitor of the Society in the Province of *Toledo*, by divers other grave and learned *Jesuites*. It was commended or justified by *Ribade-neira*, *Scribanius*, *Greiser*, and *Becanus*, of the same Society.

It was ordered to be burnt by the Parliament of *Paris* ; but *F. Cotton* could never be induced to write against it: The Authors of the Apology (publish'd at *Paris* in the name of the Society soon after the Murder of *Henry* the Fourth) durst not plainly and honestly censure it; and (whatever some credulous People are now made to believe) neither the Pope, nor Superiours of the *Jesuites* ever passed any publick Censure upon this most pestilent and Treasonable Book, But to return.

1. Suppose there be a competent Strength and interest, then the readiest and safest way, (F) is for the People to  
 'meet in a publick Assembly, to deliberate  
 'by publick Consent what is to be done, and  
 'then to keep inviolably that which is agreed  
 'upon by Common consent. The Prince must  
 'first be admonished and exhorted to amend;  
 'but if he refuse the Remedy, and there be  
 'no hopes of his amendment, the Sentence be-  
 'ing once pronounced, it will be lawful for  
 'the Commonwealth to deny Obedience to him.  
 'And because a War must necessarily follow;  
 'the Counsels how to maintain it must be set  
 E 2 down,

(F) Mariana,  
 Edit. Mogun-  
 tie 1605.  
 p. 58, 59, &c.

'down; Arms must be quickly provided, and  
 'Taxes laid upon the People, to defray the  
 'Expences of the War. And if it be re-  
 'quisite, and the Commonwealth cannot o-  
 'therwise maintain it self, it will be lawful,  
 'both by the right of Defence, and more by  
 'the Authority proper to the People, to de-  
 'clare publicly the King to be the common  
 'Enemy, and then to kill him with the Sword.

'The Commonwealth (from which the  
 'Royal Power hath its Original) may, when  
 'the case requires it, bring the King to Judg-  
 'ment, and deprive him of his Sovereignty;  
 'for the Commonwealth hath not so trans-  
 'ferr'd the Right of Power to the Prince, but  
 'it hath reserved a greater Power to it self.

'2. But if there be no opportunity for the  
 'States of the Kingdom to assemble; in this  
 'case of necessity, they may dispense with the  
 'Formalities of Law, any man may do that  
 'which the Commonwealth is supposed to do;  
 'if it should be done; the common voice of  
 'the People shall be his Warrant that cuts off  
 'the Kings Head.

'3. But what if this be like to endanger the  
 'Traitors Neck?

'Then he may take away the King by com-  
 'veying a strong and subtil Poyson into his  
 'Garment or Saddle, as the Moors have  
 'kill'd their Enemies with poysoned Presents.

But 'tis time to draw to a conclusion of this Head; *J. Goodwin* in one of his Pamphlets hath this remarkable expression; *As for offering violence to the person of a King, or attempting to take away his Life, we leave the proof of the lawfulness of it to those profound Disputers the Jesuites, &c.*

And one of his Adversaries in a Letter to him declares, that *J. Goodwin* is (for ought he knows) the first and only Minister of any Reformed Church, that ever was of that Jesuitical Opinion, as himself styles it. (L)

(L) Nether-  
sole in a Letter  
to J. Goodwin  
Printed Jan. 8,  
1648.

And though I will not undertake to make good that Assertion; yet to the Positions of any of our Sectaries I can oppose the Authorities of a whole Herd of Jesuites and other Divines of the Roman Church. But to all these Observations I will only add one more; That as a Preparative to the Murder of King *Charles the First*, a Book was printed *An. 1648.* (licensed by *G. Mabbot*) bearing this Title, *Several Speeches delivered at a Conference concerning the Power of Parliaments to proceed against their King for Misgovernment.*

The Heads upon which these Speeches are pretended to be made, and the very Matter and Expressions (excepting only some few not material Passages, are wholly taken out of the Book of *Parsons*, (an English Jesuit) the great Design of which was to baffle the Title of King *James* to the Crown of England, animate the People

to Rebellion, and introduce the *Roman* Catholique Religion. All the difference is, *Parsons* published his Book by way of Dialogue, these turned it into Speeches.

This *Parsons* was Rector of the *English* College at *Rome*, missed very narrowly of a Cardinals Cap; of how great esteem he was at *Rome* may be gather'd from that famous Inscription on his Monument, (M) And he hath furnished the Seditious Spirits amongst us with Arguments and Precedents for their Practises against the King.

*' This false new Title (they are the words of Mr. Prinne) published at this Season, intimated to the World, that this Discourse of a Jesuit (for which he was condemned of High Treason) was nothing else but Speeches made by some Members of the Cammons House at a Conference with the Lords; of which Book though himself and divers others complained, there was nothing done to vindicate the Houses from this gross Imputation. (N)*

By all which we see that the Popes and Jesuites (though at a distance) contributed very much to the late Bloody Wars in *England* and the dismal consequences of them.

All the difference I can find between the Heads of both Factions is only this; Whether the Power of Deposing and Chasti-

(M) Aligambe  
p. 413, 414.

(N) Prinne's  
Speech in the  
House of Com-  
mons Decemb.  
4. 1648. p.  
209

Chastising Kings belongs to the People or to the Pope ? The Fanatique Sectaries allow the People (by their Representatives) to resume the Power into their own hands ; whereas some of the Popish Fanatiques reserve this Power to the Pope as the Common Father of Christendom. Some I say, for the greater part of them invest the Commonwealth with this Authority.

And so much of the first Proposition.

2. In the Reign of King *Charles* the First, the Pope stirr'd up his Subjects (of the *Roman* Communion) to Rebel, forbad them to take the Oath of Allegiance, and absolved them from their Obedience.

In the beginning of his Majesties Reign the Pope by his Bull strictly forbids the taking the Oath of Allegiance. (O)

(O) Urban 8.

*Dilectis filiis*

*Catholicis An-*

*glia. Rome*

*Maii 30. 1126.*

(P) In a Bull

dated Octob. 8.

1642, to *Euge-*

*genius Oneal.*

(Q) This Bull

is dated May

25, 1643. all

which Bulls

are extant in

the Histories

of those times,

and therefore

need not be

transcribed.

*An. 1642.* The Pope persuades *Eugenius Oneal* to give proofs of his Valour in joyning with the *Irish* Catholiques against the Heretiques, grants to him and all his Adherents the Apostolical Benediction and Plenary Indulgence. (P)

*An. 1643.* he grants a Bull of Plenary Indulgence to all the *Roman* Catholiques of *Ireland*, who had joyned in the Rebellion began in the year 1641. (Q)

When the *Irish* Papists submitted to the King, subscribed and swore to the observation of the Articles agreed upon; the Pope absolved them from their Oath, took upon himself to be their General in the person of his Nuntio, assumed the exercise of the Regal Power, imprisoned those *Roman* Catholiques, and threatened to take away their Lives, who had promoted the Peace, and desired to return to their Allegiance to his Majesty.

And 'tis observable, That soon after the most Infamous Rump had crowned all their Wickedness with the Murder of his Sacred Majesty, they nulled the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and so made themselves as *Innocent as the Child unborn*. (R)

(R) Feb. 9.  
The House  
voted that the  
Oaths of Alle-

giance and Supremacy should be Null and Void; *Memoria's of the English Affairs.* ad an. 1648.

Thus I have proved (with as much brevity as a Discourse of this consequence would admit) That neither the Reformed Churches abroad, nor the Church of *England* gave any encouragement to the late Bloody Wars in *England*, or the Murder of the Lords Anointed; and I have shewed what Influence the Principles and Practises of the prevailing Faction of the *Roman* Church had upon them.

I have omitted nothing that deserves our Consideration, except the *Gunpowder Treason*; which having been the Subject of many Sermons and Books, I shall pass it over only with these two Observations.

1. The late Lord *Stafford* at his Tryal declared, ' *That he never heard any of the Church of Rome speak a good word of it.* ' (S) In the printed Tryal, p. 53.  
(S)

The truth is there is nothing to defend such a Master-piece of Villany but the Sword; what the *English* Papists speak of it concerns not me to enquire; but was not the rise of that Horrid Treason from the *Breves* of Pope *Clement* the 8th. in which he required the *Roman* Catholiques not to admit any but a Catholique to the Crown? Did not the same Pope (by a Bull sent to the Superiors of the *Regulars*) forbid them to make use of any thing revealed in confession to the benefit of the Secular Government; and is it not (at least) highly probable that the said Bull had a particular respect to the *Gun-powder Treason*? (T) See The Case put by *Delrio* the Jesuit, *Disqu.* Mag. c. 1. §. 11. 2.

Did not Sir *E. Digby* call it the best Cause?

Was not *Garrett's* name inserted into the *English Martyrology*?

Was not one of the Conspirators made the Popes Pænitentiary, and another a Confessor in *St. Peters* at *Rome*?

2. He

2. He saith, *'That the Plot was owned by the Traytors themselves at their death.*

But did not Garnette and Tresham deny it with the most bitter Imprecations? make the most solemn Protestations of their own Innocency, and avow the Lawfulness of denying and forswearing any thing whereof they were guilty, in case either the Judges be incompetent, or the Proofs against them defective?

And 'tis observable, that Garnette never owned any thing which was laid to his Charge, till (as himself confessed) the clearness and unexpectedness of the Proofs made him ashamed to persist any longer in his Denial. ( V )

V) H. Casau-  
soni Ep. ad  
Fr. Durzum p.  
117, 118, 120,  
121, 122, &c;

I have now done with the Court of Rome and its Adherents. Of the Doctrines of the Church of Rome and General Councils I shall speak in the next Chapter; by which it will appear, whether the Instances of Popish Malice and Bloodiness are Justifiable by the Principles of the Roman Church and Religion.

CHAP.



## CHAP. III.

*Doctrines and Principles of the Roman Church.*

1. *The Doctrine of Deposing Princes. This is the Doctrine of all the approved Writers of that Church; Of their General Councils, of their Publique Offices and Breviaries. An Account of those persons who have appear'd against the Deposing Doctrine.*
2. *The King-killing Doctrine. It is a necessary consequent of the Deposing Doctrine. The Roman Divines equivocate in this Question. The Jesuites generally assert it; divers of the Popes and the Canon Law approve of it.*
3. *Of destroying mens Lives for Religion. The true State of the Question. The Church of Rome damns all Hæretiques. All Protestants are Hæretiques in her account. She enjoyns all Christians to endeavour the Extirpation*

tion of them. All Bishops of her Communion sworn to destroy them. The Laws of the Church deliver them up to the Secular Power to be put to death.

4. Of absolving his Majesties Subjects from their Allegiance.

I come now to his Lordships Principles of Faith and Loyalty, as they are called p. 44.

But first he declares; [*As to the damnable Doctrine of King-killing, if he were of any Church whatsoever, and found that to be its Principle, he would leave it.*]

Doubtless (saith our Author) the thing which most weighed to my Lords Prejudice, &c. was a prepossest Opinion of wicked Principles supposed to be held and practised by my Lord, as the matter of his Faith and Religion. It is by many taken for granted, the Papists hold it an Article of Faith, that to depose and murder Kings, to Massacre their Neighbours, and destroy their native Country by Fire and Sword (when the interest of their Religion requires it) are Acts dispensable by the Pope, and meritorious of Heaven. Now what thing so wicked, however slenderly proved, will not easily be believed against men so principled? My Lord therefore to clear himself and his Religion from this heavy and

(at

(as the Papists say) injurious Aspersions, protested and declared in the presence of God and their Lordships, his hatred and detestation of such Principles; That he acknowledged the King his lawful Sovereign, and knew no Person or Authority on Earth could absolve him from his Allegiance. ]

From hence I shall take occasion to discourse on the following Heads.

1. Concerning the Doctrine of Deposing Kings.

2. Concerning the Doctrine of King-killing.

3. Concerning the Massacring of their Neighbours and destroying their Native Country, when the Interest of their Religion requires it.

4. Concerning his Lordships acknowledging the King to be his Lawful Sovereign, and that he knew no Person or Authority on Earth could absolve him from his Allegiance.

And here I shall fairly represent the Doctrines of the *Roman Church*, and then leave all men to judge of the natural Tendency of them.

1. I begin with the Doctrine of Deposing Kings.

Where I shall prove these three things.

1. That it is the Doctrine of all the Approved Writers of the *Roman Church*.

2. That

2. That it is the Doctrine of their General Councils, and lawful Representatives of the *Roman* Church.

3. That this Doctrine is taught in the Breviaries and publique Offices of the Church.

1. That it is the Doctrine of all the Approved Writers of the *Roman* Church.

And here (to do our Adversaries right) I acknowledge, that there are some things wherein they agree, and some wherein they differ.

That Sovereign Princes may in some cases be deprived of their Crowns and Dignities, is a Doctrine wherein their Divines are so universally agreed, that I do not know any Book, published according to the Order of the *Roman* Church, which hath plainly and honestly condemned it.

But they are not agreed, whether by vertue of a direct temporal Power over all (at least Christian) Princes, the Pope may depose them at his pleasure; or whether he hath only an indirect power, whereby he may depose them when it is necessary for the good of the Church. The former Doctrine is current at *Rome*, and hath been avowed by many Popes, and their Creatures. The latter is Matter of Faith, as many of their own Writers prove by as good Arguments and Authority, as any man can

can produce for Transubstantiation it self. (A) And to let you see that his Majesties Roman Catholique Subjects are no Honefter than the rest of the World, I appeal to two very late Writers of our own Country.

(A) Of the former l. *sacra Ceremon. Ed. Romæ 1560. p. 36 col. 1.*  
*Figurat Pontificalis hic gladius potestatem*

*summam temporalem a Christo ejus Vicario collatam.*

And this Power was challenged by Pope Gregory the 7th. as of Divine right, Platina *de vitis Pontificum* Colon. 1568. p. 176.

By Boniface the 8th. *id. p. 247.*

By Paul the Third in his Damnatory Bull against Henry the 8th. King of England. *Bullarium Chirubinis, Tom. 1. p. 619. (Ed. Romæ, 1632.*

By Pius the 5th. in his Damnatory Bull against Queen Elizabeth, Tom. 2. p. 304. Both which Bulls begin thus; *Regnans in excelsis, &c. hunc unum super omnes gentes & omnia Regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, &c.* To which I might add Paul the 4th. and Sixtus the 5th.

Bellarmino *de R. Pont. l. 5. c. 1.* quotes some others of this Opinion. For the latter see the Authors quoted by Bellarmine *de R. Pont. l. 5. c. 1.* and *ad versus Barclæum* in his *Opuscula.*

Salmeron *Tom. 4. p. 413.*

Fr. Romulus *Resp. ad Apol. (Ed. 1591.) p. 41, 42, 43.*

Cardinal Perron in his Oration to the third Estate at Paris tells us, That unless this Doctrine were approved, it follows that the Church of Rome for many ages hath been the Kingdom of Antichrist and Synagogue of Satan.

Some years since three Treatises were published under the Title of *The Jesuites Loyalty*: The Author of the first roundly asserts (what the other two silyly insinuate) this Deposing Doctrine, and proves it by as great Authority, as they can bring for any Article of the present Roman Faith.

The

The other is an *English* Jesuite too; and he (without any mincing of the matter) tells us this Doctrine was long ago taught by almost all Orders and Professions, Seculars, Regulars, Divines, Lawyers, before the Jesuites were in being. (B)

(B) See D. Stil-  
lingfleet's An-  
swer to several  
late Treatises,  
In the Preface.

And whether they teach the Popes Power to be direct or indirect 'tis all one; for if Princes may be deposed in some cases; if there be no standing Court (Independent on that at *Rome*) which is to Judge when it is necessary to depose them; they had as good tell us in plain terms, that no Prince is to wear his Crown any longer, than the Pope and other Princes, or his own Subjects will give him leave; that the Pope never wants Authority to depose a King, but when he wants strength or courage, a fair excuse or a fit opportunity.

(C) Bezar. re-  
cognit. lib. 5. de  
Pont. c. 8. Eccle-  
sia non semper  
privat Principes  
dominio; vel  
quia vires non  
habet, vel quia  
non judicat ex-  
pedire.

(C) And therefore there is no reason, why they should have the reputation of moderate men, that seem to restrain and qualifie the abuse of the Popes direct temporal power, or to write against it with some pomp and vanity; when indeed they do but abuse the world with a distinction, which serves only to veil the impiety of the former assertion, and make Princes secure and inapprehensive of their danger.

Again,

Again, the assertors of the Pope's indirect Power are not agreed, whether a Prince may forfeit his Crown for misgovernment, or unfitness to govern, or whether only for Apostacy or Heresie?

The Doctrine of deposing Kings for misgovernment is approved by the Authentick Canon Law of the *Roman* Church. (D)

If a Prince become a manifest Apostate, he falls from all power and dignity, in the Judgment of all their approved Divines and Canonists. (E)

That a Prince may be deposed for Heresie, is so generally received, that those very persons of the *Roman* Church, which have written against it in other cases, do except the case of Heresie. And 'tis observable that in their General Council of *Lyons* (wherein *Frederick* the Emperor was deposed for Heresie) his Advocate endeavoured to vindicate him from the guilt of that crime, but neither the Emperor nor he excepted against the power of the Church to depose him in the case of Heresie.

(D) Decret.  
par. 2. Can. Ali-  
us Caus. 15. qu.  
6. Zacharias  
Regem Franco-  
rum, non tam  
pro suis iniqui-  
tatibus, quam  
pro eo, quod  
tantæ potestati  
erat inutilis, à  
regno deposuit.  
(E) Parsons ex  
*Creswell* (or  
both) under  
the name of  
*Philopater Seft.*  
2. n. 157.

(F) Conc. Lat.  
4 c. 3 an. 1215.  
de hæreticis.  
tom. 28. p. 161,  
162.  
Conc. Lugdun.  
an. 1245. tom.  
28. p. 424, &c.  
Conc. Constant.  
tom. 29. an.  
1414 p. 458.

3. This is the Doctrine of the General Councils and lawful Representatives of the *Roman* Church, as the Reader may find in the Margent. (F) I know the Council of *Trent* made no express Decree about the deposing of Princes; but he that considers the State of Christen-

F

dom

dom at that time ; how many Princes had been already driven out of the *Roman Church*, and how many more were ready to follow them, will rather wonder they said so much, than that they durst say no more. For though it was no time for them to speak their minds, yet so true were the Fathers of that Council to their Master at *Rome*, as to keep up his claim to a temporal power over Princes. For did they not make bold to Excommunicate and deprive Emperors, Kings, and Princes of all their Dominions held in Fee of the Church ? (G) ‘ By this Canon ( saith a Royal Author ) the Kingdom of Naples had need look well to it self. (H) For one Duel it may fall into the Exchequer of the Roman Church, because that Kingdom payeth a relief to the Church as a Royalty or Seignorie that holdeth in Fee of the said Church.

(G) *Concil Trident. tom. 35. Sess. 25. c. 19. in the Decree against Duels.*  
(H) *R. James his works. p. 449.*

And had not the Kingdoms of *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland*, need look well to themselves too ? For if we believe the Popes and their dependents, they are the Dominions of the Church ; the Pope is our Sovereign Lord, the King is but his Vassal ; and did not King *John* grant to Pope *Innocent* and his Successors, the Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*, and receive them back again, upon paying yearly a relief to the Church ? Did not *Innocent* the Third, and *Innocent* the Fourth call the Kings of *England* their Val-



Vassals ? (I) Did not the Pope declare to Queen *Elizabeths* Resident that *England* was held in Fee of the Papacy ? (S) Since his Majesties restauration, the *Lovaine* Divines insisted on this title of the Pope to the Kings Dominions, and it seems his Holiness was well enough pleased with it. (M)

(I) *Mat. Paris* (Ed. *Lon.* 1640.) ad an. 1216. p. 280. & ad an. 125. p. 272. (S) *History of the Reformation* part 2. P. 374. (M) *History of the Irish Re-*

monstrance. p. 117. and p. 101. *placuit Pontifici; reservat in sua tempora.*

*Baronius* endeavours to make out the Popes title. *Tom.* 12. ad an. 1159. & ad an. 1172. And *Spondanii*, *Continuat. Baronii* Paris 1658. tom. 1. p. 327. ad an. 1299. *Bellarmine* *Apol. pro resp. &c.* ed. 1610. p. 33, 34, 35. That the Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland* are Tributary to the Pope.

Again, did not the Fathers of *Trent* confirm all the Canons of Popes and Councils in favour of Ecclesiastical persons and liberties, and against the infringers of them ? (N) Did they not take care to preserve the Authority of the *Roman* See in all things ? (O) And confirm the *Capitula* of the Council of *Lateran*, in which the deposing Power is asserted ?

(N) *Council.* *Ibid. Sess. 25 de Ref.* c. 20. (O) *Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. de Ref.* c. 21.

But that I may not seem to conceal any thing which our Adversaries have to say for themselves, I do acknowledge that three plausible exceptions are made to these testimonies.

1. They say, the forecited Canon is not an Act of the Fourth Council of *Lateran*, but of the Pope only.

But if we may value the Judgment of the Council of *Trent*, or of a Synod of our own Nation above the opinion of some private men, we must conclude, that this Decree was the Act of the greatest Council which the Church of *Rome* hath to boast of.

For the Council of *Trent* divers times refers to the Capitula in question, as the Acts of the General Council of *Lateran*, (P) And so doth the Council of *Oxford*, held a few years after that of *Lateran*.

(P) *Conc. Trid. de Ref. Sess. 5. c. 2.* refers to *Conc. Lat. 4. c. 10.*  
*Sess. 13. c. 9.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 21.*  
*Sess. 24. c. 1.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 51.*  
*Sess. 25. c. 8.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 12.*

*Concil. Oxon. an. 1222. (Conciliorum tom. 28.)*

*c. 24.* refers to *Conc. Lat. 4. c. 20.*  
*c. 28.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 47.*  
*c. 29.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 66.*  
*c. 33.* to *Conc. Lat. c. 15, 16, 17.*

2. Others allowing this to be the Act of the Council, pretend it is to be understood of inferiour Feudatory Lords, not of Sovereign Princes.

I would not affix a more odious sense on the Fathers of that Great Council, than their Decrees do import; but when

consider by what Spirit they were acted, what Antimonarchical Doctrines they taught, I cannot easily be induced to a belief of their honesty in this matter. For they strictly forbid all Clergymen ( not possessing Temporalties or Secular honours ) to swear Allegiance to Secular Powers. (Q) They denounce the terrible sentence of Excommunication against such Magistrates as demand any Tribute of Churchmen. (R) They make another Decree (wherein the Approbation of the Council is expressed) equally destructive of the Rights of Princes; which must either extend to Sovereign Princes, or else it was made to no purpose. I mean the Decree, in which all the Princes of Christendom are required to be at peace with one another for four years, under pain of Excommunication, and loss of their Dominions. (S)

(Q) *Conc. Lat.*  
4. c. 43. p. 125.  
(tom. 28.)

(R) *Conc. Lat.*  
4. c. 46. p. 197,  
198.

(S) p. 119, &c.  
In the beginning of the  
Decree are

these words; *Sacro approbante Concilio definimus, &c. — Et qui acquiescere forte contempserint, per Excommunicationem in personas, & interdictum in terras arctissime compellantur, &c. Quod si forte censuram Ecclesiasticam vilipenderit, poterunt non immerito formidare, ne per auctoritatem Ecclesie circa eos, tanquam perturbatores negotii Crucifixi, secularis potentia inducatur.*

But to come to the matter in question;  
'If the temporal Governour being required  
'and admonished by the Church, shall neglect  
'to purge his Country from Hæresie, (and  
'we know the meaning of that Word) let  
'this be signified to the Pope, that from hence-

‘ forth he may declare his Subjects free from  
 ‘ their Allegiance, and give away his Land  
 ‘ to be possessed by Catholiques, &c.—Saving  
 ‘ the Right of the Principal Governour, if he  
 ‘ gives no hindrance and impediment in the  
 ‘ matter; but nevertheless let the same Law  
 ‘ be observed towards them who have no Prin-  
 ‘ cipal Governours over them. Thus the  
 Council of Lateran.

If this Canon be not to be understood  
 of Sovereign Princes, as well as subordi-  
 nate Lords and Deputy Governours, what  
 doth the Council mean by that expression,  
 ‘ Nevertheless let the same Law be observed  
 ‘ towards them, who have no Principal Go-  
 vernours over them? Do not those words  
 plainly import thus much; Let their  
 Dominions be given away in the same  
 manner?

What doth the Council mean by that  
 other Expression, ‘ Saving the Right of the  
 ‘ Principal Governour, if he gives no Impedi-  
 ‘ ment? If he do, it seems his Countries  
 are to be given away too.

Did not the Popes challenge and exe-  
 cute a power of Deposing Sovereign  
 Princes (as well as Subordinate Lords) be-  
 fore the Sitting of this Council? And  
 would any man of common Sense have  
 given (at least) so fair a pretence for the  
 continuance of this Power, if they were  
 not well enough pleased with it?

3. It is pretended that the deposing of Frederick the Emperor in the Council of Lyons was no Act of the Council.

Against which I have these things to say.

1. This Assertion is wholly precarious; for I do not find so much as one plain and positive Testimony in favour of it.

2. The Decree for the recovery of the Holy Land, wherein Princes are enjoyned to keep the Peace under pain of Excommunication and Interdicting their Kingdoms, is expressly said to be made with the approbation of the Council.

(T)

(T) *Concil.*  
*Lugdun. (tom.*  
*28.) p. 445. Sa-*  
*cro approbante*  
*Concilio.*  
(V) *Nos super*  
*præmissis cum*  
*fratribus nostris*  
*& Sancto Con-*

3. The Emperor was deposed after mature deliberation had with the Council. (V)

*cilio deliberatione præhabita diligenti, &c. In the History of the Council.*

The same words are in the Popes Constitution. *Bullar. Cherub.* tom. 1. p. 64.

*In M. Paris (Ed. Lond. 1640) p. 772. An. 1245.*

*Platina p. 220. Omnium consensu Imperio & Regnis privatur.*

*And Bellar. Tract. de pot. sum. Pont. adversus Barclaium (in opusc. p. 845.) hæc sententia est summi Pontificis, toto approbante Concilio, hoc est tota consentiente & laudante Christianorum Præsulum universitate.*

(X) History of  
the Council p.  
458, 459. (in  
the 28th. Tome  
of the Coun-  
cil.

4. If the Council had favoured the Emperor, there can be no reason, why he should appeal from that to another General Council, and not rather from the Pope to that Council. (X)

3. But it is time to proceed to the last Proof, which is from the publique Offices and Breviaries of the *Roman Church*.

(Y) V. Brevi-  
arium Rom. ex  
Decreto S.S.  
Concil. Trid.  
restitutum, Pii  
5. jussu editum,  
Et Clementis  
8. auctoritate  
recognitum.

St. *Peters Universal Monarchy* (which is the Foundation of the Popes Power over Princes) is expressly taught in the *Roman Breviaries*. (Y) And how can any man be a true Son of that Church, which doth not joyn in her publick Offices? How can he say *Amen* to those Prayers, which he believes do contain any false Doctrine in them?

(Ed. Ant.  
1614.)

*In Festo Petri & Pauli Jun. 29. p. 710. Tu es Pastor Ovis, Princeps Apostolorum, tibi tradidit Deus omnia regna mundi; & ideo tibi tradite sunt claves regni celorum.*

*In Festo Petri ad Vincula Aug. 1. p. 741. Tibi tradidit Deus omnia regna mundi.*

Sihneron (Ed. Col. Agrip. 1602.) tom. 4. p. 410. Expounds these words of the Breviary in the same sense; viz. Of the Popes Temporal Power.

And now let it be considered, That this Doctrine hath been taught by all the approved Writers of the *Roman Church*, and by the Authentique Canon-Law; by the General Councils, and by the publique Breviaries.

And

And this is no mere Speculative Doctrine, but a kind of State-Engine fitted to raise and support the Papal Monarchy; Have not the Bishops of *Rome* made use of it, as often as it was in their Power and served their Interest? Have they not trampled on the Necks of Princes, and absolved their Subjects from their Allegiance? Disposed of their Crowns and Dominions, animated their own Subjects and other Princes to take up Arms against them? Cast them out of the Church and out of their Kingdoms? Yea so true have they been to this Principle, that not only such as were very Prodigies of Pride and Tyranny, but even the more prudent and moderate Popes have so often put it in practise, that the troubles and Confusions, the Wars and Treasons which have followed in Christendom, make up a

( Z )

(Z) See the Catalogues of Princes excommunicated and deposed

by Popes in their own Authors. *V.G. Bellar. de R. Pont. l. 5. c. 8.*  
*Ezovius de Pont. Rom. c. 46. p. 613. to 620.*

*Paul* the third Excommunicated and deposed our *Henry* the Eighth. *Bullarium tom. 1. p. 619.*

*Pius* the Fifth Excommunicated and Deposed Queen *Elizabeth*, tom. 2. p. 305.

*Clement* the Eighth sent two Breves into *England* to debar King *James* from succeeding to the Crown. See King *James* his Works. p. 257.

And yet after all the Complaints and Sufferings of Princes under this Usurped Power, not the least care is taken (either  
 by

by the Church or Court of *Rome*) to secure their Rights.

(A) A Decree made at *Rome* March 2. 1679. condemning some Opinions of the Jesuites and other Catholics.

Why did not the Council of *Trent* make a plain and Honest Explication of the Popes Power and the Rights of Princes, when they had so fair an opportunity to vindicate themselves and their Religion? And in what request this Doctrine is at *Rome*, may appear from hence; that since the breaking out of the Popish Plot in *England*, the present Pope was pleased to condemn sixty five Propositions, but (as great a Scandal as their Religion lay under amongst us) could not find in his heart to speak one unkind word of this Doctrine. (A)

I know some private persons, and some Assemblies of Church-men (of the *Roman* Communion) have at some times taught the contrary Doctrine; but it concerns them, not me to reconcile their Determinations with the Doctrine of their Church. However I will say these three things.

1. They have been such as were overawed by Princes, or in expectation of Favours and Preferments from them.

2. They have been censured and excommunicated by the Teaching Governing part of the Church, and (as much as in them lay) shut out of her Communion.

3. Where



3. Where Princes Excommunicated and deposed for other real or pretended Crimes have procured any Advocates to plead for them ; yet they have either excepted the case of Hæresie, or not undertaken to prove the Unlawfulness of deposing Princes for it.

2. The next thing to be considered is the Doctrine of King-killing.

Concerning which the late Lord *Stafford* did indeed declare, That *'if he were of any Church whatsoever, and found that to be its Principle, he would leave it.*

But this Patron of the *Roman* Cause did not think fit to acquaint us with that expression of his Lordship, (in the printed Tryal p. 53.) *'As to the Doctrine of King-killing, and absolving Persons from their Allegiance, I cannot say the Church of Rome does not hold it, I never heard it did hold it, it may be it does, it may be not, I say not one thing or other.*

From which words we may learn these two things.

1. That his Lordship knew not that the Church of *Rome* had any where condemn'd this wicked Doctrine.

2. That the *English* Priests and Confessors do not plainly and honestly disavow and condemn it, or instruct their Profelites in the Principles of Loyalty.

Indeed

Indeed the Church of *Rome* hath not in exprefs terms asserted the Lawfulness of putting Kings to death ; but there is so little difference between the deposing and putting Kings to death, that whosoever allows of the one, can be no Enemy to the other, if he understand the Consequences of his own Doctrine. For when a King is deposed by any lawful Authority, he is a King no longer. If he take up Arms to recover his Dominions, you may fight against him with as good a Conscience as against an Usurper.

And will a King be so tame, as to lay down his Crown at the Popes or his Peoples Feet ? Will he suffer himself to be stript of his Royal Dignity without striking a stroke, or soliciting the Assistance of other Princes ?

I would not imitate the uncharitable Spirit of the *Roman* Church, whilst I am writing against it ; nor dare I charge all men with the Consequences of their own Doctrines ; but I am sure, many of the greatest Divines and Casuists of that Church have both seen and vindicated them, and I do not find that the rest are able to confute them.

‘ But (saith Cardinal Perron in his fore-cited Orations) a King deposed, being once Reformed and become a new Man, may be  
‘ re-

*restored to the lawful use and practise of his  
Regality*

And what if he will not reform? what if he be more hardned in disobedience than *Childerick* was, and prefer his own Honour and Conscience above the Bull of a Pope, or the Act of a Rebellious Faction in his own Kingdom? truly then he may lose his Head (as well as his Crown) notwithstanding any care the Church of *Rome* hath taken of him. If he take the Field, so may his Enemies; it may be they have been before hand with him.

But suppose the poor disarmed man (a King you cannot call him if he have no right to the Crown) be not able to raise Forces, and therefore resolves to trudge to his Holiness, and there bare-headed, bare-footed (as we know who did) humbly beg Absolution of the Pope: Perhaps he may be in a good Humour; grant him Absolution upon such terms as he did *Henry the 4th.* that he submit himself to the Judgment of an Assembly of the States.

But what if it be now too late to reform? It may be his Kingdoms are already given away to another; (for the Popes are free enough in giving what is none of their own) or perhaps the Estates of the Kingdom have turned it into a Commonwealth.

In Fine, Princes deposed from their Sovereignty are liable to so many hazards, that they have seldom survived their deprivation, unless it were in exile or in a Prison.

But I must pass over the Jugglings and Equivocations of men of King-killing Principles. Ask them if it be lawful to kill a King? They tell you no; and many of them call God to Witness the Integrity of their Hearts and Loyalty of their Practises.

But if a King fall from the Faith, and become an Enemy to Gods Church and People; If he do (*regis personam exuere*) turn Tyrant, and abuse his Power to the hurt of the Church and Commonwealth; If he be deposed (for his Sins against God and man) by the Pope, or the Estates of his Kingdom; Then he ceases to be a King any longer; he is to be used as a publique Enemy; the Tyrant, the man of Blood, the Apostate, the Hæretique may be put to death without killing the King. And (to do them Justice) I confess some of them are so kind to a King, that they will not allow any private person to put him to death; but he that is Commissionated by the Pope, or Subordinate Magistrates is no private person in the sense of these men.

This is the Divinity of those Politicians and Divines, which either promoted the hellish Murder of the late King, or afterwards wrote in Vindication of it: And there are scarce any Treasonable Positions or Distinctions, Presidents or Arguments, to be found in their Books or Pamphlets, which are not either expressly contain'd, or (at least) to be parallel'd in the Works of the Jesuites and other *Romish* Doctors. They are not for killing a King! but before they put him to death they will be sure to Un-King him; and he shall suffer not as a King, but as a Malefactor. They will not resist the Authority of a King; but if he betray the Trust reposed in him, the wicked Person placed in Authority, may be punished not as a King, but as a Tyrant.

To look for an express determination of this Point in the General Councils of the *Roman* Church, is to seek it where there can be no reason to expect it; but the General Councils have taught the World the distinction between the Kings Person and Authority; and according to their Principles, a lawful Prince doth by his Wickedness, or Misgovernment, fall from his Authority, and cease to be a King. (B)

P. 104. *Evincere potestis, non vos, amentia aut furore percitos Regem trucidasse, sed amore libertatis, religionis, justitiæ, honestatis, patriæ Charitate accensos Tyrannum punisse.*

(B) Concil:  
Gen. Ludg.  
Conciliorum  
Tom. 28. p. 434.  
*Memoratum  
Principem,  
(Fredericum)  
qui se imperio  
& regni omni-  
que honore ac  
dignitate red-  
didit tam in-  
dignum, quique  
propter suas in-  
iquitates à  
Deo ne regnat  
vel imperet est  
abjectus, &c.*

And Milton  
speaks not on-  
ly the sense,  
but the very  
words of the  
Jesuites. *Pro  
pop. Angl. def.  
p. 103. Jæ  
Populi communi  
ab injusto Re-  
gum dominatu  
assererem, non  
id quidem Re-  
gum odio, sed  
Tyrannorum,  
&c.*

If the Councils speak doubtfully, or in general terms, Whom should the People resort unto for Instruction, but their Confessors? What Books should they consult, but such as are published with Authority and approbation of the Governing part of the Church?

And as the *Roman* Church hath left the particular Directions for Conscience and Practise, to the Practical Divines and Casuists; so (above all others) the *Jesuites* have for many years been entrusted with the conduct of Mens Souls, and bore the greatest sway in his Majesties Dominions.

At their first coming over (which was about an hundred years ago) they quickly insinuated themselves into the Affections of some of the prime Nobility, and of multitudes of the Common People. (C) Within twenty years after they had almost devoured all the Secular Clergy (D). And since his Majesties happy Restauration, they made their boasts, That many of the *Roman* Catholick Nobility and Gentry were Penitents of the Society. (E)

(C) *Sanders*,  
de Schism.  
*Angl.* p.188.

(D) See the  
Important  
Considerati-  
ons by the  
Secular Priests,  
*An.* 1601.

(E) See the  
*Jesuites* Paper, presented to divers Persons of Honour, and printed 1662.

I know one of the *Jesuites* (not long since Executed for High Treason) did with his dying breath declare, That the *King-killing Doctrine* was falsely charged upon the *Jesuites*.

In Answer to which bold Assertion, I will only say these two things :

1. That most of the Divines of that Order (which have had occasion to treat of this Argument) do expressly teach, That a *lawful Sovereign Prince* may in some cases be put to death: i. e. If he fall from the Faith, and endeavour to pervert his Subjects; If he abuse his Power, and Rule in a Tyrannical manner; If he be Excommunicated and Deposed by the Pope, or declared a publick Enemy, and deprived by the Estates of his Kingdom.

2. That amongst a great number of Books written by *Jesuites*, and Licensed according to the Rules of the Society, I could never meet with one, which hath freely and sincerely condemn'd this Doctrine.

'But (saith Cardinal Perron) never any Pope went so far, as to give consent or Counsel for the desperate Murdering of Princes.

1. And yet the first Christian Bishop, that ever approved of the Murder of a lawful Sovereign Prince, was Gregory the first.

2. The Fundamental Principles of Treason against Kings and Princes, were laid by *Zachary*, *Gregory the Seventh*, &c.

3. The Rebellion against *Henry the Third* and *Fourth of France*, was encouraged and abetted by the Bishops of *Rome*,

(F) *Cambden*  
*Eliz. par. 2.*

p. 13. ed. Lond. (F)  
1627.

*Cum Rex prolem non haberet, nec habiturum spes nulla esset, & regnum Navarro, & post Condeo Reformatæ religionis propugnatoribus jure deberetur, Pontificii Principes, Pontifice & Hispano consensu, conjunctionem perniciosam occultè inierunt sub Religionis Catholicæ tuenda velo, nomine S. Unionis, siue Ligæ, ad Regem pessundandum, publicam, in illum invidiam accendendo, & ad Reformatam religionem funditus extirpandam, prævertendo legitimam in regno successionem.*

For the Leaguers in that Kingdom (under a pretence of Zeal for the Roman Catholick Religion) entred into a wicked Combination against their Sovereign;

(G) *Davila*,  
(An. 1576):  
P. 452.

‘And *Gregory the 13th* hearkned to their Proposals with much readiness (G). But *Sixtus the Fifth* Excommunicates the next Heir of the Crown, declares him incapable of the Succession, absolves his Vassals from their Oaths, and Excommunicates all such as adhered to him. This Declaration of the Pope pierced *Henry the Third* very deeply, without whose Privy it had been propounded in the Consistory, subscribed by the Cardinals, posted up and published

(H) *Davila*,  
L. 7. P. 574, 575. (H)

‘*Thom*



Three years after his Holiness writes  
 Letters to the Duke of Guise (the Head of  
 the League) full of infinite Praises; com-  
 pares him to the holy Macchabees, (the  
 Defenders of Israel) exhorts him to fight  
 for the advancement of the Church, and  
 total extirpation of the Hugonots (I).

(I) Davila,  
 l. 9. (An. 1588)

Afterwards the Pope publishes a Moni-  
 tory against the King (L); And that  
 infamous Regicide which embred his hands  
 in the Royal Blood, Murdered Henry the  
 Third without killing the King, which was  
 now un-King'd by the Pope.

p. 715.  
 (L) L. 10:  
 p. 811.

Upon the News of the Kings Murder,  
 the Pope makes a Panegyrick Oration,  
 and solemn Thanksgiving in the Con-  
 sistory; and in his Canting Sermon per-  
 verts the Holy Scriptures, admires the  
 wonderful Providence of God in the  
 death of his Anointed, compares the  
 Bloody Fact to the Mystery of the Incar-  
 nation, and extols the Traytor above  
 Eleazar. (M)

(M) Thuanus,  
 l. 96. p. 461.

This Speech was printed at Paris, An.  
 1589. by the Authority of the Holy  
 League, and with the approbation of  
 three Doctors of the Loyal Colledge of  
 Sorbonne.

Our Countryman Parsons (though he  
 will not own the Speech which goes a-  
 bout under the Popes name) acknow-  
 ledges, that Sixtus, in a secret Consistory,  
 upon the first News of the Fact, did ut-

ter a certain Speech in admiration of the strange Providence of God, in chastising by sounexpected a way, so foul and impious a Murder, as that King had committed upon a Prince and Cardinal, without any form of Judgment. (N)

(N) *Parson's* discussion of the Answer of Mr. Barlow, printed 1612. *permissu Superiorum.*

(O) Resp. ad Apol. &c.

And *Bellarmino* (who could not be ignorant of what passed in the Consistory at that time) when it was urged against him by King *James*, first endeavours to shift it off, but without any positive denial, and at length does what he can to vindicate it. (O)

How the Popes assisted the Leaguers with Men and Mony against *Henry the Fourth*, may be seen in *Davila*, whom I cited before.

(P) *Du Moulin* Answ. to *Philanax. &c.* p. 59.

4. Since Cardinal *Perrons* time, a Pope and his Counsel (as a Reverend Author of our own Church assures us (P), gave Consent and Council for the taking away the life of (an Excellent Prince) King *Charles the First*.

'Tis indeed below the dignity and policy of the Popes, to do the drudgery of putting Kings to death, or venturing their Necks for the *Good old Cause*; but they can fight against Princes with *Bulls* and *Anathema's*; hire Souldiers with Mony, or with Indulgences; invade their Dominions with their own Souldiers, or with

with the Forces of *Roman* Catholick Kings; stir up Insurrections within their Kingdoms, or authorize their own standing Army of *Jesuites, Monks and Friars* to kill them with the approved Catholick Weapons, with Pistol or Poyson,

And if to bless God for exalting a Regicide to his Masters Throne; if to furnish Rebels with Principles and Presidents; if to sanctifie Rebellious Leagues; if to extol the Murderers of Princes, and to give Advice for the cutting them off, do not prove that the Doctrine of *King-killing* is the Principle of Popes, (or Heads of the *Roman* Faith) then we may quit the Rebels in the late times, and even the most infamous *High Court of Justice*.

Lastly, by the Authentique Laws (Q) of the *Roman* Church, any furious Zealot may kill an Excommunicate person; and if it come into the Popes head to let his Thunder-bolts flee abroad, then that which we call *High Treason* may deserve a Crown of Martyrdom.

(Q) Decret. par. 2. Can. Excom. Caus. 23. qu. 5. *Non eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus Excommunicatos zelo Catholicæ ma-*

*tris ardentis, aliquos eorum trucidasse contigerit.* The Title of the Cannon is, *Non sunt homicidæ, qui adversus Excommunicatos zelo matris Ecclesiæ armantur:*

(R) Of this Bull, see *Cherub. Bullar.* Tom. 3. p. 250, 251. and Tom. 4. p. 354, 355. *Filliutius quest. Mor.* Tom. 1. Tract. 16.

Whether his present Majesty be by name Excommunicated at *Rome*, or not, I am not concern'd to enquire; but I am sure he lies under the General Excommunication of the *Bulla cana*. (R); and 'tis a received Rule, That the Supreme Power may in great necessity dispense with the Formalities observed in ordinary cases. If it be notorious that a King is an Heretick, and an obstinate Favourer of Hereticks, then secret and summary proceedings against him are warrantable, and the issuing out of Bulls and Citations would but alarm a Prince, and expose the *Romish* Faction to the severity of the Laws.

But since all those matters of form are only circumstantial; since the design of the Law is to bring Heretical Princes under the consequences of the Churches Censures, there can be no reason, why the Circumstantial parts of it may not be superseded upon extraordinary Emergencies.

Thirdly, I proceed to the Massacring their Neighbours, and destroying their Native Country with Fire and Sword, when the interest of their Religion requires it.

*When the interest of their Religion requires it?*

But

But what if they be not able to root out the Hæretiques?

The Roman Catholique Religion is so good natur'd and kind (to us shall I say, or themselves?) as to let us live, when they are not in a Condition to destroy us. (S)

(S) See Bellar.  
de Laicis, l. 3.  
c. 22. Cum au-

tem in particulari, &c.  
ad hac idoneas, &c.

Philop. Sect. 2. 160. Si vires habeant

Greg. 13. Facultates concessæ R. Personis & E. Campiano pro Anglia, Ap. 14. 1580. Tūdemū quando publica ejusdem Bullæ Executivæ fieri poterit.

And Ribadeneira de Principe l. 1. c. 26. p. 178, 179. (Ed. 1603.)

We have not forgotten the Memorable Saying of Henry the Fourth of France.

'Henry the third (that was but a Favourer  
'of Heretiques, or at most heretically affect-  
'ed, after the issuing out of the Popes Moni-  
'tory against him, fetcht a Deep Sigh, and  
'said, It was a hard case, that he which had  
'fought for Religion should be excommunica-  
'red, because he would not suffer his own  
'Throat to be cut by his Rebellious Subjects;  
'when they that had sackt Rome, and kept  
'the Pope Prisoner, had never been brought  
'under that Censure. Sir (said the King  
'of Navarre) but they were victorious: Let  
'your Majesty endeavour to conquer, and be  
'assured the Censures shall be revoked; but if  
'we be overcome, we shall all die condemned  
'Heretiques. (T)

(T) Davila,  
l. 10. An. 1589.  
p. 811.

Again: It must be noted, that there are other ways of rooting out Hæretiques

besides Fire and Sword. What think you of rooting them out by degrees, without noise or tumult; by demolishing their Temples, seizing on their Estates, perverting their Children, forcing thousands of them to leave their Native Country, and exposing the rest to Violence and Rapine? (V)

(V) It was  
Campanella's  
Advice to the

King of Spain (then aspiring to the Monarchy of the West) to proceed in this method against Hæretiques. *cap. 11. p. 69, 70.*

Contzen (the Jesuite) was of the same mind. *Contzen polit. c. 18. p. 103. &c. (Ed. 1629.)* The Book is dedicated to Ferdinand the Emperor, under this Head; *Modus reducendæ vera Religionis.*

But these things being premised for the right stating of the question, let us come to the resolution of it.

And is there indeed such a Religion to be found in the World, that teaches men to Massacre their Neighbours, and destroy their native Country with Fire and Sword? A Religion which transformes men into Wolves and Tygers! A Religion which teaches men to kill their Brethren for Gods sake, and please God by doing the works of the Devil! I speak it with grief and shame, that Popery (abstracted from common Christianity) is such a Religion. I will not here insist on the Gunpowder Treason, the horror of Queen *Maries* dayes, the dreadful stories of the Inquisition, the *Parisian* and *Irish* Massacres, the infinite slaughters of the poor *Albigenses*, and *Waldenses*, the more than  
Hea-

Heathenish barbarities exercised on millions of the *Americans* upon the account of Religion; these would afford matter for an entire History, and therefore I shall sum up what I have to say under four heads.

1. The Church of *Rome* doth (as much as in her lies) damn all Heretiques; make them the members of the Devil (I speak their own words) whilst they live, and send them to hell when they die.

The fourth General Council of *Lateran* damns all Heretiques; and what doth that Council mean by Heretiques, but all such as do not submit to the *Roman* Faith, (as it is there set down) and particularly all which do not own the monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which that Council makes an Article of Faith. (X)

(X) Conc. Lat.  
4.c. de fide Ca-  
tholica. et c. 3.  
de Hereticis.

Besides the general Anathemaes of the Councils, all Heretiques are solemnly cursed every *Maundy Thursday*. Good God! that any thing which is called Religion should teach or allow men to damn their Brethren, even whilst they are commemorating our blessed Saviour who died for them! But I do not wonder that they should condemn our bodies to be burnt, who condemn our souls to everlasting fire. (Y)

(Y) Decret.  
Greg. 1. 5. tit. 7.  
de Hereticis c.  
3. Nullatenus  
dubites, omnem

hereticum vel Schismaticum cum diabolo & angelis ejus, aeterni ignis incendio participandum, nisi ante finem vitae Catholica fuerit incorporatus & reintegratus Ecclesiae, &c. And what the Canon Law understands by Hereticks you may see c. 9.

2. All

2. All Christians are enjoined by the Church to endeavour the extirpation of Heretiques to the uttermost of their power, as they desire to be accounted Christians.

About the latter end of the Twelfth, and beginning of the Thirteenth Century, *Dominick* and his brethren persuaded the Civil Magistrates in *France* to burn all such as were condemned for Heresie; and that their cruelties might be acted by a Law, the Holy General Councils, promised their blessing and protection to them that should root them out, Decreed that all Heretiques should be delivered up to the Secular Magistrate, who (if he refused to do his duty) should be compelled to it by Ecclesiastical Censures, by absolving his Subjects from their Allegiance, and by giving away his Dominions to other Princes. (Z) And even that sober piece of Popery (as the Council of *Constance* is called) invited *J. Husse* and *Jerome* of *Prague*, (two good and learned men) thither, to dispute with them for their Religion, whom they quickly silenced with the Catholick Arguments of fire and fagot.

(L) Conc. Lat.  
3. (Concil rom.  
27) c. 27. de  
hereticis. (this  
was an. 1180.  
Conc. lat. 4. c.  
3. de hereticis  
an. 1215.

Thus a *Romish* General Council (and that none of the worst of them) owned the most inhuman cruelty and breach of publick Faith, in the sight of the Sun.

From



From whence we learn these two points of *R. Catholique Divinity*.

1. That no Secular Prince hath any right to promise safety to Hereticks.

2. If he do, the Church may declare his promise null and void, and demand justice against them, notwithstanding the most solemn promise to the contrary. And what greater honour can be done a Sovereign Prince, than to be made the Churches Executioner?

3. All the Bishops in the *Roman* Church are bound under pain of perjury, (A) In the Oath before cited (which every Bishop takes at his Consecration) to destroy their Christian brethren. (A) A very fit employment for Spiritual Fathers!

is this clause; *Hereticos, Schismaticos, et rebelles Domino nostro vel Successoribus praedictis pro posse persequar & impugnabo.*

4. By the Laws of the *Roman Church* (B) Heretiques all men condemned for Heresie are to be condemned by the Church put to death. (B) are to be delivered up to the

Civil Power; (*Animadversione debita puniendi pro viribus excommunicati, &c.*) Conc. Lat. 4. c. 3.

But what the Punishment is, all men know which have read the History of the Council of Constance. *In illis persistens* (J. Huss) *apatribus de haeresi damnatus, vivus exstus est.* In the History of the Council. Council. tom. 29. p. 238.

*Vid. Decret. Greg. 9. l. 3. c. 1. de Hereticis.*

*Sexti Decretal. l. 1. tit. 2. de haeresi.*

*Extrav. Com. l. 3. tit. 3. de Hereticis.*

Indeed

Indeed the Church could only damn the Souls; the burning the Bodies of Hæretiques belongs to the Civil Power; for if they refused to abjure, or were relapsed, they were to be delivered to the Secular Arm, and the Magistrates were to burn them in some publique place.

In the Second year of *Henry* the Fourth (King of *England*) a Law was made, whereby if any Hæretiques being convicted did refuse to abjure, or after Abjuration did fall into relapse, they were to be left to the Secular Court according to the Holy Canons; and the Major, Sheriffs or Bayliffs (after the Sentence) were to receive and cause them to be burnt in an high place before the People. But the common course of the Law, was to certify into the *Chancery* the conviction of an Hæretique, upon which the Writ *De Hæretico comburendo* was issued out for the burning of him. Afterwards all Civil Officers were sworn to use their utmost diligence and power for the destroying of Errors and Hæresies, and to assist the Ordinaries and their Commissaries in their Proceedings against them.

In *Queen Mary's* Reign hundreds of the Clergy and Laity, were burnt alive upon no other account but their Religion; there was nothing else either in their Accusation, or in their Sentence. (C)

(C) See Statut.

ap. 2. Hen 4.

c. 15. An. 25.

Hen. 8. c. 14.

Also the History of the Reformation, &c.

(An. 1679.)

part. 1. lib. 1.

The Writ for burning of Archbishop

*Cranmer* may

be seen in the

second part of

the same History, l. 2. In

the Collection

of Records,

Numb. 27.

ably and

ably and Lastly, I consider his Lordships Declaration; 'That he acknowledged the King his Lawful Sovereign, and knew no Authority on Earth could absolve him from his Allegiance.

That the General Councils of the Roman Church have arrogated to themselves a Power of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance to Sovereign Princes, is so evident from the forecited Testimonies, that I need not trouble either the Reader or my self with transcribing the Decrees of those Councils; but to the former authorities I will only add that of the third Council of *Lateran*, which did expressly absolve the Subjects of Princes from their Oaths of Allegiance. (D)

Whether that Council did include Sovereign Princes in that Decree or not is not material; for since the Rights of Inferiour Princes are properly their Sovereigns; to absolve Subjects from their Allegiance without asking the Sovereigns leave, is to deprive the Sovereigns of their due.

That this Power hath been challenged and executed by divers Popes upon Sovereign Princes, (as well as Subordinate Lords) and particularly upon *Henry the 8th.* and *Queen Elizabeth*, is notorious to all the World; and they did no more than the Laws of the *Roman Church* allow. (E)

(D) *Cont. Lat.*  
34. 27, de Hereticis. (Council. tom. 27.)  
p. 461. Relatos autem se novum a debito fidelitatis & hominil, &c.

(E) *Decret.*  
par. 2. caus. 15.  
qu. 6. c. 4. Nos Sanctorum, &c.  
*Decret. Greg.*  
l. 5. tit. 7. c. 16.

I know not why the *Roman* Catholiques should call this an Usurpation of the Popes; when they are entrusted by the General Councils with the Interpretation and Execution of all their Decrees.

(F) See Dr. Stillingfleet's Answer to several late Treatises, (1674) in the Preface, where his words are cited.

But what need I insist on the proof of this Proposition? When his Lordship (in the printed Tryal) declared, 'He could not say the Church of Rome does not hold it, only he never heard it did. And a learned Author of that Church in Answer to this Charge saith; 'As to the Popes Power of absolving Subjects, I beg leave to wave such curious Controversies. (F)

Thus I have endeavoured to give a clear and satisfactory Account of these four great Questions; and proved my Assertions by as good Law as any is in the *Roman* Church at this day. I know nothing that can invalidate the Testimonies which I have produced, unless they can shew, either that I have misquoted any of the Laws, or mistaken the Sense of them; that they have been condemned or abrogated by some publique Act of the Church, binding to all persons of that Communion; or else that the same Principles which oblige the *Roman* Catholiques to receive the other Articles of Faith (wherein we differ from them) do not also oblige them to receive these Canons and Decrees.

But

But if none of these things can be proved, then let all men judge, 'Whether  
 'the Treasons and Seditions in other Coun-  
 'tries, especially the late bloody Wars in  
 'England, and Hellish Murder of the Lords  
 'Anointed may by the same reason be im-  
 'puted to the Protestant Religion; as Queen  
 'Mary's Cruelties, the Powder Plot, the Irish  
 'Barbarism, the French Massacre, and  
 'many other Instances of Popish Malice and  
 'Bloodiness from former Examples may be  
 'charged on the Roman Church and Reli-  
 'gion?

---

## CHAP.

T

T

T

T

T

P.

M  
ve  
bee  
Se  
th

## CHAP. IV.

*Testimonies of the Loyalty of the Roman Church and Religion, considered.*

*The first from St. Math. 22. 21.*

*The second from the Decree of the General Council of Constance.*

*The third from the Annotations of the Divines of Rhemes, on Rom. 13.*

*The fourth, from the Censure of the Doctors of the Faculty of Sorbon, against a Book of Sanctarelus.*

P. 44. **L**est this might seem a meerly extorted Profession of a despairing Man, My Lord endeavoured to prove by several convincing Testimonies, he had ever been Instructed and Educated in the same Sentiments, as the established Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church.

H

I. His

1. *His first Testimony was taken from places of Holy Scripture; particularly that of St. Math. 22. 21. Render to Caesar the things that are Caesars; &c. from the plain and clear sense of which, and other Texts of Holy Writ, nothing (he said) in this World was able to remove him.*

That we are bound to render to all Men their dues, and to *Caesar* the things that are *Caesars*, is not disputed among any sort of Men that I know. But how shall a *Roman-Catholick* understand which are the Rights of *Caesar*; or by a just and equal distribution give to God what is Gods, and to the King what is the Kings.

The Holy Scriptures indeed have told us with all plainness and sincerity, what we are to give to *Caesar*; but the lusts and interests of Men have perverted the clearest Texts, and made them serve their own Pride and Covetousness.

I believe his Majesty will hardly stand to the determination of the *Rhemish Divines*, by whom his Lordship, saith he, was instructed in the Principles of Faith and Loyalty. For our Blessed Saviour commands us, to render unto *Caesar* the things that are *Caesars*; and his own practice was a Comment on his Precept.



But the *Rhemists* in their Annotations on that Text, are afraid to speak plain, as Men that mean honestly should do.

They are more afraid of giving too much, than too little to *Cesar* (A).

In their Annotations on *St. Math. 17.* they roundly tell us, that *Cesar* hath no right to any payments from the Clergy.

(B) *Rhem. Annotations on St. Math. 22. 21. (B) Rhem. Annotations. 8. St. Mat. 17. 26.* Though

Christ, to avoid scandal, paid Tribute; yet indeed he sheweth, that himself ought to be free from such payments, as also his Apostles, and in them the whole Clergy, &c. Which Exemption and Priviledge being grounded upon the very Law of Nature it self, &c.

And in *Hebrews 5. 1.* in all Matters touching God, his Service and Religion, the Priest hath only Charge and Authority; as the Priest Temporal is the Peoples Governour, Guide and Sovereign, in the things touching their worldly Affairs.

And one of the Holy General Councils of the *Roman Church*, tells us, (and pretends to prove it from Scripture too) that *Secular Princes* ought not to require any Tribute from the Clergy. (C)

*imponant Ecclesiis onera.* And in the Margent we have Gen. 47. quoted.

2. His second Testimony was taken from the Authority of the General Council of Constance, (to which all Roman Catholics are bound to submit) the 15th Canon and definition of which Council is, Quilibet Tyrannus potest, & debet licite, & meritorie, occidi, &c. Every Tyrant law-

fully and meritoriously may, and ought to be killed by any Vassal or Subject whatsoever, even by hidden Treacheries, and subtile Flatteries or Adulations, notwithstanding any Oath given, or confederation made with him; without expecting the Sentence or Command of any Judge whatsoever. (Which Clause is added in regard of the right of Supream Temporal Monarchs over Inferiour Princes subordinate to them.) This Doctrine the Synod declares to be erroneous in Faith and Manners, and the same as Heretical, condemn, &c.

The Council condemned this Proposition! And would not an Assembly of the old Heathen Philosophers have done as much? Had the same Proposition been brought before them, and upon the same occasion, I am confident (as far as we can judge by their Writings) they would have made a better provision for the security of Princes, than the Fathers at Constance did.

But since it is acknowledged, That all Roman Catholicks are bound to submit to this Council of Constance, I will fairly represent some of the Doctrines of it.

That damnable Doctrine of breaking Faith with Hereticks was notoriously Patronized and put in practice by this Council: For the Emperour had granted

a safe Conduct to *J. Hufse*; and yet after he had been some weeks at *Constance*, the poor Man is (contrary to his safe Conduct) cast into Prison. This being done in the Emperours absence, he comes to the Council, argues the case with them; upon which they pass that Infamous Decree contained in the 19<sup>th</sup> Session; from which it is plain, that in the case of Heresie, no Prince is bound to keep Faith with any persons whatsoever. And this Act of the Council so fully satisfied the Emperours Conscience, that he looked on himself as discharged from his obligation, and not only concurred in the Sentence against the Prisoner, but gave order for his Execution.

*J. of Prague* was trepann'd by a safe Conduct granted by that Council; and being unacquainted with their Arts and Treachery, ventures to *Constance*, where understanding the Jugglings of his Adversaries, he thought to shift for himself by flight, but being taken was burnt to death.

Again, The Council of *Constance* Excommunicates and deprives of all Secular honour and dignity, all that should presume to hinder *Sigismund* from meeting with the King of *Arragon*, whether they be Kings, Dukes, Princes, &c. as all men know, which have been conversant in the Acts of that Council.

Bnt I come to the Decree produced by his Lordship; a Decree which some *Roman* Catholicks of these Kingdoms know how to make their advantage of; when others of greater Authority and Eminency in the *Roman* Church ( that dare speak their minds ) freely acquaint us with the true Catholick meaning of it.

(D) Suarez.  
def. fid. Cath.  
l.6.c.4. p.417.

Tell them of the Council of *Constance*,  
‘ It meddles not (saith one (D)) with He-  
‘ retical Princes Excommunicated and De-  
‘ posed by the Pope, or by the Commonwealth  
‘ and States of the Kingdom.

(E) Greg. de  
*Valentia*, Tom.  
3. disp. 5. qu. 8.  
punct. 3. In  
his resolution  
of this Question;  
*utrum liceat privato cuilibet civi occidere Tyrannum?*

‘ A lawful King, ruling in a Tyrannical  
‘ manner, may be punished only by publick  
‘ Authority (saith a Second (E)); that is,  
‘ by the Commonwealth, as himself expounds  
‘ it.

(F) Verone  
Apol. par. 2.  
c. 13.

‘ This Decree extends not to Tyrants,  
‘ which conspire against the Publick good, or  
‘ against the *Roman* Catholick Religion;  
(saith a Third (F).)

‘ A Commonwealth that is oppressed by a  
‘ Prince ruling Tyrannically, may, and ought  
‘ to have recourse to a Superiour Prince, as  
‘ the Pope or Emperour, for the punishment of  
‘ him; but if this remedy cannot be had  
‘ without danger, the Commonwealth may by  
‘ her own Power pass Judgment on such a  
‘ Prince; and if he be incorrigible, either  
‘ depose

' depose him, or put him to death, (saith a Fourth (G).)

' Another wrote a Book in the time of the French League (H), in the compiling whereof (as he tells us in the Preface) he was assisted by many Lawyers and Divines. In this Book he asserts the Lawfulness of putting a King to death, after he is condemned by Publick Authority.

(G) Dom. Bannes Scho- last. Comment. Tom. 4. p. 174. (Ed. 1614.) qu. 64. Art. 3. (H) I mean Bouchier the French Jesuite, in that Treasonable Book which I quoted before.

Lastly, our Country-man Parsons justifies the Doctrine of Bouchier; and because Mr. Morton is charged with misrepresenting his sense, let us take Parson's Account of Bouchier's meaning (I).

(I) Parsons in his quiet and

sober reckoning, Sec. p. 318, 319, 321.

' He holdeth, That a Private man may not kill a Tyrant, which is not first judged and declared to be a Publick Enemy by the Commonwealth; and he proveth the same by the Decree of the Council of Constance. But Bouchier grants (saith Mr. Morton) That when the Commonwealth hath condemned and declared any Tyrant for a publick Enemy, he may be slain by a private Man.

' Whereunto I Answer, That then he is no Private man, for that he doth it by the publick Authority of the Commonwealth, as doth the Executioner that cutteth off a Noble-mans Head by Order and Authority of the Publick Magistrate.

These are not the Opinions of private Doctors; their Books are Licensed according to the Order of the *Roman Church*, and approved by Divines of great Learning and Authority; they prove the Orthodoxy of their Doctrine from this very Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which is now alledged as an Argument of *Roman Catholick Loyalty*.

And are not Kings and Princes wonderfully beholden to this Council? They must be put to death with a little more solemnity than other Mortals, and fall by the Sentence of a Papal Consistory, or of an High Court of Justice. 'Tis not lawful for a common Parricide to Stab or Pistol the Lord's Anointed of his own head.

No, but his Holiness may hire Soldiers against him with Money, or with Indulgences; He may invade his Country with his own Armies, or with the Forces of Catholick Princes; he may stir up a Rebellion within his Dominions, or Authorize his own standing Army of *Jesuites*, *Monks*, and *Friars*, to kill him with the approved Catholick Weapons, with Pistol or Poyson. Lastly, the Commonwealth (by its own, or the Popes Authority) may try and pass sentence upon him.

These

These things considered, I cannot but conclude, that it was a poor Security: which the *Irish* Remonstrants offered to his Majesty, since his Restauration, by declaring against the killing of Kings by any private Subjects. (L)

(L) We do hold it impious, and against the

Word of God, to maintain, That any private Subject may kill or murder the Anointed of God, his Prince, though of a different Belief and Religion from his. And we abhor and detest the practise thereof as damnable and wicked. *Irish* Remonstrance in *F. Wallsh* his History, p. 8.

3. P. 45. My Lords third Testimony was taken from the Annotations upon Rom. 13. in the English Catholick Edition of the New Testament, set forth by the Colledge of Divines at Rhemes. The words are these, upon the Text, He that resisteth, &c. ver. 2. Whosoever resisteth, or obeyeth not his lawful Superior, in those Causes wherein he is subject to him, resisteth Gods Appointment, and sinneth deadly, and is worthy to be punished, both in this World by his Superiour, and by God in the next life; for in Temporal Government and Causes, the Christians were bound in Conscience to obey even the Heathen Emperours.

And upon v. 4. some Protestants of our time care neither for the one, (the Prince) nor for the other (the Prelate) though they extol only Secular Power, when it maketh for them. The Catholicks only most humbly obey both according to Gods Ordinance; the one

*one in Temporal Causes, and the other in Spiritual. ]*

*(In the Rhemish Testament it is the ( not some )  
Protestants of our time, &c. )*

A mighty Testimony of *Roman Catho-  
lique Loyalty !* You are not *to resist  
your Lawful Superior !* But if a Prince  
be lawfully deposed, then he is no lon-  
ger your Lawful Superior. If you be  
Clergymen, then he is none of your So-  
veraign, and you are none of his Sub-  
jects.

*In those Causes wherein you are Subject to  
him !* But what if a King challenge (as  
by the Word of God he may) the Su-  
pream Government in all causes Ecclesia-  
stical and Civil ? In those Causes you are  
not Subject to him ; for doth not the Pope  
claim the Supremacy in all Ecclesiastical  
and even in Temporal Causes, at least in  
*ordine ad Spiritualia ?*

Let the *Rhemists* complain that the *Pro-  
testants* extol only the *Secular Power* ; We  
acknowledge the King to be Supream Go-  
vernour in all Causes and over all Persons  
within his Majesties Dominions, (for this  
is all that we attribute to the *Secular  
Power*) and 'tis the Glory of our Church  
to have taught and suffered for this Do-  
ctrine. But for the Loyalty of the *Rhe-  
mish* Divines, I refer the Reader to some  
of



of their Annotations, as they are cited in the Margent. (M) He that desires to see a true Character of the *English* Seminaries, may consult a Treatise penn'd by the direction of one of the greatest Statesmen, and wisest men of his Age, under this Title; *The Execution of Justice in England, &c.* Reprinted An. 1675.

(M) The *Rhemish* Testament was set forth by that Traiterous Seminary of *English* Papists, and printed at *Rhemes* An. 1582.

See the former part of their Annotations on *ver.* 4. of this 13th Chapter to the *Romans*, where they complain, That now all is given to the Secular Power, and nothing to the Spiritual, which expressly is ordained by Christ and the Holy Ghost.

The exemption of the Clergy is asserted *Annot.* on *S. Matth.* 17. 26.

The Popes Infallibility, *Annot.* on *S. Luke* 22. 31. And in the Margent they say, Popes may err personally, not judicially or definitively.

The Popes Supremacy, *Annot.* on *S. John* 21. 17.

And on *1 Pet.* 2. 12. They say, Although all Power be of God, and Kings Rule by him, yet this is no otherwise, than by his ordinary Concurrence and Providence.

[ My Lords 4th. Testimony was taken from the Censure of the Doctors of the Famous Faculty of Sorbon against a Book of Sancta-rellus, particularly against the 30th. and 31th. Chapters: In those two Chapters, these Propositions are contained; That the Pope can punish Kings and Princes with Temporal Penalties, and depose and deprive them of their Kingdoms for the Crime of Heresie, and free their Subjects from their Obedience; and that it hath been always the Custom in the Church; and for other Causes also, as for Faults, if it be Expedient; if the

the Princes be Negligent; for the insufficiency and unprofitableness of their Persons. Likewise, That the Pope hath Right and Power over Spirituals, and all Temporals also; and that both the Powers Temporal and Spiritual are in him by Divine Right; That it was to be believed, that Power was granted to the Church and its Chief Pastors to punish with Temporal Penalties ( Princes ) the Transgressours of Divine and Humane Laws, especially if the Crime be Haresie. Likewise that the Apostles were subject to Secular Princes *de facto non de jure*, by Fact not by Right. Moreover that as soon as the Pope is installed, all Princes begin to be subject to him! Lastly, That he expounded the Words of Christ, Whatsoever ye shall bind upon Earth, &c. to be understood not only of the Spiritual, but of the Temporal Power, &c. The Faculty (after mature deliberation) disapproved and condemned the Doctrine contained in these Propositions, and other like Expressions in the same Chapters, as new, false, erroneous, and contrary to the Word of God.

Given in the Sorbon, Apr. 4. 1626.]

In Answer to all which I have many things to say, but that I may not exceed my intended brevity, I shall reduce them to the following Heads.

I. That this Book of *Sanctarellus* was revised and approved by persons of greater Authority in the Roman Church, than the Divines

Divines of *Sorbon*. (N) It was printed at *Rome* *permissu Superiorum*, approved by three Divines of the Society, licensed by the General of the Order, by the Master of the Sacred Palace, and several other Divines. By which we see what kind of Divinity was then in request at *Rome*. But it may be the Divines of the *Roman Church* have one Conscience at *Rome* and another at *Paris*, as was once said of the Jesuites.

(N) *Alegantibus* *Bibl. script. soc.* *Jes.* in the life of *Sanctarellus* gives us this Character of him, *Vir moribus apprimè religiosus & modestissima mansuetudine.*

The Title of the Book is

*A. Sanctarelli soc. Jes. Tract. de Hæres. &c. Ed. Romæ. 1625.* In the License of the Master of the Sacred Palace are these words; *In eo omnia religioni consona atque utilia adinvenimus.* In another of the Licenses, *In quo nihil repari, quod Sanctæ Fidei, aut bonis moribus adversetur.*

2. Since the breaking out of the Popish Plot in *England*, when so many of that Religion were in danger of their Lives; the Pope thought fit to condemn 65 Propositions (as I shewed before) but did not speak one word against the Power of deposing Princes, though it was asserted in the same Divines and Casuists with the 65 Propositions. And whether the Judgment of his Holiness, or of the Divines of *Sorbon* be of greater value with *Roman Catholiques*, let all men judge.

3. Why do the Church and Court of *Rome* suffer an hundred as bad Books as this of *Sanctarellus*, (in which the same or worse Propositions are maintained) to pass not only without Censure, but with publique

public Authority and Approbation?

4. There are no Propositions in the places censured by the *Sorbonists*, which he might not justify by the Principles of the Bishops of *Rome*, the most correct Editions of the Canon Law; and in the Sentence of Excommunication and Deprivation of *Frederick* the Emperor (with the Approbation of a General Council) the Pope expounds the words of Christ (as *Sanctarellus* since did) not only of the Spiritual, but of the Temporal Power also. (O)

(O) In the General Council of Lyons

(*Concil. tom. 28. ut supra.*) Innocent the 4th. with the consent of the Council denounces Sentence of Deprivation against *Frederick* the Emperor. *Nobisque in B. Petri apostoli persona sit dictum, quodcunque ligaveris, &c. S. Matth. 18.*

Also *M. Paris*, *an. 1245. p. 672.*

5. What hath *Sanctarellus* said, more than the Doctors of the Famous Faculty of *Sorbon* did both before and since the Publishing of his Book?

I know that Ancient College of *Sorbon* did for many years keep up a great reputation, and was esteemed the Bulwark of Regal Authority; but ever since the rise of the Jesuites, many of their Determinations have been carried by Interest and Faction.

*An.*

An. 1589: (a little before the Murder of Henry the third of France,) the People of that Kingdom proposed these two queries to the Divines of Sorbon:

1. 'Whether the People of France may not be discharged and set free from their Oaths of Allegiance made to Henry the Third?

2. 'Whether they may not with a safe Conscience Arm and Unite themselves, collect and raise Money for the Defence and Preservation of the Roman Catholics in that Realm, against the wicked Counsels and Practises of the said King, and all other his Adherents, and against the breach of Publique Faith committed by him at Bloys, to the prejudice of the said Roman Religion, and Edict of Holy Union, and the natural Liberty of the Assembly of the three Estates of that Kingdom? After mature deliberation upon the said Articles, it was concluded nemine refragante, That the said People were discharged from the said Oath of Allegiance; and that they may with a safe Conscience unite and Arm themselves against the King. Moreover the said Faculty thought fit to send their Decree to the Pope, that it might be ratified and confirmed by the Authority of the Holy Apostolick See.

(P) Davila  
l. 10.  
And Fawlis  
History of Ro-  
mish Treasons  
(Ed. 1671.)  
P. 530, 551.

In the same year the Loyal Doctors of Sorbon declared their Approbation of the damnable Doctrine of King-killing. For a short Paper was drawn up, containing the Reasons of taking up Arms against the King; in the Conclusion of which it is said, That because Childerick King of France had caused one Bodille to be publicly whipped, the said Bodille took occasion thence to kill the King, for which he is commended by Historians, and therefore may not the injury done to a better than Bodille, viz. to a brave Prince (Guise) be also avenged?

The Doctors of Sorbon having read over the Tract, approved it, affirming that nothing was in it contrary to the Roman Church.

About the same time it was Decreed by the Sorbonists, That the Name of Henry the third should be dashed out of all publique Prayers; and that if any of the Faculty of Paris agree not to it, they should be Excommunicated. Accordingly instead of those Prayers for the King, & others were drawn up for the Catholique Leaguering Princes. (Q)

(Q) Fowlis,  
p. 537.

An. 1598.

*An. 1590.* The Royalists had spread abroad such Propositions as these; 'That Henry of Bourbon (the lawful Heir of the Crown) might or ought to be King; that the People might with a safe Conscience adhere to him and pay him Tribute; That the Pope had no Power to Excommunicate the King; That an Haretique, though re-lapst and put out of the Communion of the Church, may have right to the Crown of France. All which Propositions were presently condemned by the Faculty of Sorbon. (R)

(R) Spondani Contin.  
Baronii tom. 2.  
ad An. 1590.

(p. 860.) par. 3. Sorbonici Theologi in publicis turbis ad rerum instantium statum veta sua accommodare coacti, rogatu Federatorum & Cajetani impulsu, nec non Cardinalis Montalti, ipsiusque Pontificis literis, ad fidem & religionem tuendam, & unionem confirmandam incitati, partes suas interponentis congregati sanxerunt, propositiones quæ passim a pluribus seminabantur; viz. Henricum Borbonium regis titulo insigniri posse aut debere, tuta conscientia et adharere, ac decimas & vassalialia persolvere debere, &c. Has & ejusmodi enuntiationes damnantes, &c.

*An. 1629.* They publish a Decree, 'That for the Future the Ancient and Laudable Practise be revived; that every Batchelour of Divinity swear to observe the Decrees of the Popes of Rome. (S)

(S) Spondani Contin.  
Baronii Tom. 2.

(p. 982.) ad Ann. 1629. par. 10.

*An. 1647. The Sorbonists, in Answer to a Question sent to them in Writing from the Jesuites in England, resolved that it was Lawful for the Roman Catholics to work the Change in the Government by making away the King.* (T)

(T) Du Moulin *Answ. to Philanax*, p. 59.

I know *P. Walsh* hath printed ( from the Originals ) six Declarations of the Divines of *Sorbon* presented to the *French King An. 1663.* which seem more worthy of that Society, than these which I have produced. But, however significant they might be of their Loyalty to the *French King*, they do not reach the Case of his Majesties *Roman Catholique Subjects.* For in *France* the King is of the same Religion; His Kingdoms are under no Ecclesiastical Censures; the Pope challenges no direct Temporal Right to them.

But I need say no more of them, than *F. Walsh* himself doth; *These Declarations of Sorbon did neither profess against Equivocation; nor descend to the particular Cases, either of Excommunication, or the pretended Exemption of Clergymen, or Condemnation of the Contrary Doctrines, &c.* (V)

(V) *Hist. of the Irish Remonstrance* p. 662, 663, and 678.

And



And now let all men judge whether the Doctors of *Sorbon* were not as good at irritating the People of *France*; as the most Seditious Preachers and Pamphleteers were at Animating those of *England* against their King?

---

(187)

Now in all the papers which  
the Editor of the London  
Times has published of the  
last year, and which are  
now in the hands of the  
public, there is no mention  
of the name of the  
author.

---

## CHAP. V.

*The Fifth Testimony of the Loyalty  
of the Roman Church from a late  
Treatise of a Romish Priest.*

*The Principles of that Treatise ex-  
amined.*

*Of the Principles and Authority of  
the General Councils of that  
Church.*

*Of licensing men to lie and forswear  
themselves.*

*Of the Doctrine of Equivocation  
and mental Reservation; with a  
brief Account of the Propositi-  
ons lately censured at Rome.*

*Of the Simplicity and Godly Since-  
rity of the Roman Church.*

*Of the Design of dividing the Pa-  
pists.*

*Of the Distinction between the  
Church and the Court of Rome;  
the grounds of that Distinction  
examined and confuted,*

*Of Dispensations, &c.*

(A) In the printed Tryal p. 53. There is lately come out a Book, written by a Priest of the Church of Rome, tried for his life for being in the Plot, but acquitted, &c.

[P. 46. **M**Y Lords Fifth Testimony was taken from a little Treatise, writ (as my Lord said) by a Priest of the Church of Rome, and entituled, Roman Catholique Principles, in reference to God and the King. (A) The chief Contents of which Treatise, because it in short explains the above-named Principles, and clears the Objections usually made on this Subject, I shall here insert in the Authors own Words.]

In answer to which I shall briefly examine all the Passages of this little Treatise, which may seem to vindicate the Romish Faith and Religion from the imputation of Disloyalty.

In the beginning he tells us; *We abhor, we renounce, we abominate such Principles: (Of Treason, Rebellion, Murder, &c.)*

But of this I shall speak in its proper place.

That a Priest of the Church of Rome should (before God and the World) deny the plainest matters of Fact is an Argument either of the grossest Ignorance of his own Religion, or (which I rather suspect) of the most exact skill in the Arts of Prevarication.

V. G. [ *I have been instructed (saith he) in the Articles of my Faith, and I acknowledge the lawful Authority of General Councils; yet I profess I never learnt or found asserted in any of them any such Principles.* ]

A Speech of so much assurance, that were it not for dis-believing my own Senses, I might be apt to give credit to it. But I would fain know how he proves, that there are any such things in the world as the Decrees and Canons of Councils? Or that Transubstantiation and Communion in one kind were ever taught in any of them? Or that these words, *Hoc est Corpus meum* are in their Bibles?

If mens Senses are not to be trusted in plain sensible Matters, he will hardly prove any of these things; but if they are, then it is evident that such Principles are asserted in some of their General Councils.

What follows p. 47. shall be considered afterwards.

[ P. 47, 48. Paragraph 1. *Of the Catholique Faith and Church in General.* ]

Which Paragraph doth not fall within the compass of my present Design.

[ Paragraph 2. *Of Spiritual and Temporal Authority.* ]

[ P. 48, &c. *General Councils ( which are the Church of God Representative ) have no Commission from Christ to frame new matters of Faith, but only to explain and ascertain unto us, what anciently was, and is received and retained, as of Faith in the Church, upon arising Debates and Controversies about them. The definitions of which General Councils, in matters of Faith only, and proposed as such, oblige, under pain of Heresie, all the Faithful to a submission of Judgment.*

[ *It is no Article of Faith to believe that General Councils cannot err, either in matters of Fact or Discipline, &c. Hence it is deduced, If a General Council ( much less a Papal Consistory ) should undertake to depose a King, and absolve his Subjects from their Allegiance; no Catholique, as Catholick is bound to submit to such a Decree.*

*Hence also it followeth; The Subjects of the King of England lawfully may, without the least breach of any Catholick Principle, renounce even upon Oath the Doctrine of Deposing Kings Excommunicate for Heresie, &c. ]*

*General Councils are the Church of God Representative !*

And hath the Church of God (diffusive) intrusted them with a Power of concluding in some things and not in others; or of obliging particular persons so far  
and

and no further? Where hath the Church of *Rome* warranted any such distinction (as this Author makes) between matters of Faith and Practise; or confined the whole Power of General Councils to matters of Faith only? Lastly, suppose there were (as indeed there is not) some ground for such a distinction; yet why must Transubstantiation be a matter of Faith; and the deposing of Princes be none, when both came out of the same Forge, the General Council of *Lateran*? How doth it appear that the Council did not propose this as matter of Faith, as well as the other?

But I will appeal to the General Council of *Constance*; both because the Author of the Controversial Letters, urges a Decree of that Council to prove, That the Church of *Rome* teaches the Duty to Princes to be a direct point of Faith; (B) And because we are told, *That all 'Roman Catholiques are bound to submit to the 'Decrees of the Council of Constance.* (C)

(B) *Controvers.*  
*Lit. (Ed. 2.*  
*1674.) p. 36.*

(C) *Staffords*  
*Memoirs, p. 44.*

And doth not this Council challenge a Power immediately from Christ, which all persons of whatever state and dignity are bound to obey; both in things pertaining to Faith, and the extirpation of Schism, and the General Reformation of the Church in the Head and

Mem-

Members? (D) Did not this Council define against an *Error in Practise*, ('tis their own expression) challenge a Power of dispensing with the Institution of Christ, and even of Excommunicating all such Presbyters as should presume to obey his Institution rather than their Decree? (E)

(D) Concil.  
Const. (Con-  
cil. tom. 29. p.  
257.) *Ipsa Sy-  
nodus in spiritu  
Sancto congre-  
gata legitime,*

*Generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem repræ-  
sentans, potestatem a Christo immediatè habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque  
status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis, existat, obedire tenetur in his,  
que pertinent ad fidem & extirpationem dicti Schismatis, & Reforma-  
tionem generalem Ecclesiæ dei in Capite & Membris.*

(E) Conc. Const. Sess. 13. (p. 372, 373.) *Hoc Generale Concili-  
um declarat, decernit, & definit contra hunc errorem; (viz. Of the  
peoples receiving the Sacrament in both kinds, and after Supper)  
quod licet Christus post coenam instituerit, & suis discipulis admini-  
straverit sub utraque specie panis & vini hoc venerabile sacramentum,  
tamen hoc non obstante, &c. præcipit sub pœna Excommunicationis,  
quod nullus Presbyter communicet populum sub utraque specie panis &  
vini.*

And now to bring this whole matter to a short Issue; By whatever Arguments this Author can prove that *Roman Catholics* as such are bound to receive the Sacrament in one kind only; by the same it may be proved;

1. *That if a General Council (or a Papal Consistory by Authority derived from a General Council) should depose a King, and absolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, all Roman Catholics as such are bound to submit to such a Decree.*

2. *That*



2. *That the Subjects of the King of England may not, without breach of a Roman Catholique Principle, renounce the Doctrine of deposing Kings Excommunicated for Heresie.*

I confess there is a *Roman Catholique Principle* (of *Æquivocation* and *Mental Reservation*) by the benefit of which they may renounce the deposing of Kings, but so they may the receiving the Sacrament in one kind also.

P. 49. *Nor do Catholiques as Catholiques beleive, that the Pope hath any direct or indirect Authority over the Temporal Power and Jurisdiction of Princes, &c.*

This he asserts with his usual confidence, gives *Bellarmino* the lie, and out-faces all the Arguments and Authorities of the Cardinal and others, without offering at the least proof of his Position.

[ *It is an Article of Catholick Faith, that no Power on Earth can license men to lie, to forswear and perjure themselves, &c. on pretence of promoting the Catholick Cause or Religion.*

But let him prove, (if he will prove any thing to the purpose) That it is an Article of *Roman Catholick Faith* to believe;

Either

Either that there are no Venial Sins ; (such as do not put a man out of the Favour of God, and hazard his Salvation.)

Or that an Officious Lie is a Mortal Sin, in their account.

Or that that which otherwise would be a Lie or Perjury, may not in some cases, be excused by a Mental Reservation or Equivocation.

*[The Doctrine of Equivocation, however wrongfully imposed on the Catholick Religion, in neither taught nor approved by the Church, as any part of her Belief.]*

But if this be not a part of the Practical Divinity of the *Roman Church*, either she hath none at all, or else hath not let the World know where to find it. Indeed it is not taught in their General Councils; for they do not use to descend to particular Rules of Conscience and Practice; but it is taught by the generality of those Divines whom the Church hath entrusted with the Souls of men.

Are either the Books censured, or the Authors punished? Are not the Books published with Approbation, and those Authors most countenanced which maintain this Doctrine? Hath the Church given any Caution, or made any Declaration against it? And if after all this the Church doth not approve of it, what must become of the Souls of the people?

May

May not the most erroneous and pernicious Doctrines and Practises prevail in the Church, whilst the greatest part of it follow their Guides, and think they are bound to believe as the Church believes ?

I know 'tis commonly call'd the Jesuitical Art of Equivocation ; but though they have extended the Practise of it further ; though they have polished it with more dexterity, and defended it with more subtilty than others of that Communion ; yet I must needs say, *Parsons* spoke one great Truth, when he told us this Doctrine hath been received in the *Roman* Church for 400 years.

The Principal Cases wherein the Divines of the *Roman* Church allow of it, are these that follow.

' If a man be charged with a secret Crime, which cannot be proved by clear evidence ;  
' If the Judges before whom he appears be Incompetent ; ( as all ours in England are )  
' If it were told him in Confession, or if he hath been absolved by a Priest ; If it be necessary to the obtaining some great good, or the avoiding some great evil.

' And what a man may safely say, he may safely swear : What he may deny in a Court of Judicature, he may deny at his Execution ; For if that which otherwise would be a Lie, is saved by a mental Reservation, there can be no danger in swearing to it ; in standing upon our own vindication, and making  
' the

*' the most serious Appeals to Heaven at the  
' point of death.*

Besides, suppose it were unlawful to equivocate in any case whatsoever; yet if it be not a Mortal Sin; if a thousand Venial Sins cannot damn a man; I know no reason why they should not venture upon it to save their own Lives, or the Honour of their Religion.

In fine; This Doctrine hath been expressly avowed by the Holy See; those Divines which declaim against it with most seeming bitterness in other cases, allow of it in that of Confessions; those few Divines which have written against it, are charged with singularity or hæresie. But he that desires to see the Doctrine of Equivocation and Mental Reservation justified by the greatest Authorities of the Roman Church, may consult any of the Authors cited in the Margent; (F) whose Books are licensed and approved by their Superiours, or other Eminent Divines.

(F) Lessius de  
Antichristo in  
Opusc. (Ed.  
1626.) p. 773.

*De Justitia & Jure, c. 42. Dub. 9. n. 47, 48. p. 626, &c.*

*Bonacina tom. 2. Disp. 4. qu. 1. punct. 12:*

*Fr. Tolet. De instruel. Sac. l. 4. c. 21. & l. 5. c. 57.*

*Eudæmon Joannes Apol. pro Garnetto, c. 2.*

*Azarias Institut. Mor. l. 11. De Jure jurando. c. 4.*

*J. de Dicastillo Tract. de Juram. Disp. 2. dub. 12.*

*See also If. Casaub Ep. ad Fr. Duræum.*

*Parsons in his Treatise of Mitigation.*

*And in his quiet and sober Reckoning with M. Morton.*

*The Judgment of Pope Pius the 5th. Abbot de Mendacio Pref. p. 9. &c. And p. 39, 40.*

And

And now it were easie to give an Answer to the Decree made at *Rome* (March 2. 1679. ) against some Propositions of the Jesuites and other Casuists ; that Decree being so very lame and defective, that we are not at all secured by it from the pernicious effects of this Doctrine ; for

1. The Propositions condemned are the 27<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>th</sup>. and though I did believe those two Propositions to be false, yet I might equivocate in some of the Principal Cases before mentioned.

2. They are not condemned as evil or impious in themselves ; contrary to the Laws of God and Nature ; and consequently the Censure or Condemnation is not indispensable.

But what if a man be barr'd the use of Equivocation and Mental Reservation ? What if he voluntarily, or by the command of his Judges do renounce them ?

I answer, If they be lawful in other cases, there can be no reason why they should be sinful in this.

V. G. You are commanded to tell all you know of such a Matter ; Your Answer is, I know no more than I have told you : i. e. with this Reservation, *That I am bound to tell you.* And being further required to speak without a Mental Reservation, why may you not still answer, I do not make use of any Mental Reservation ?

(G) If. Cafaub.  
Ep. ad Fr. Du-  
razum p. 117:

tion? i. e. *So as I am bound to tell you.* This second Answer is defensible upon the same Principles with the first. So Garnette was required by the Lords Commissioners, to answer without Equivocation; yet he denied a certain Truth upon his Salvation, and with the most bitter and solemn Imprecations: (G) And this was no more than was Lawful by the Principles of Parsons, Soto, Ja. a Grassis, Bonacina, &c.

[ *On the contrary, Simplicity and Godly Sincerity are constantly recommended by her (the Roman Church) as truly Christian Vertues, necessary to the conservation of Justice, Truth and Common Society.* ]

But doth this Author think we never read the Acts of their Famous Council of Constance? I am sure J. Husse and Jerome of Prague felt the sad effects of the *Simplicity and godly Sincerity* (which are but other names for breach of publique Faith) of the *Roman Church*.

Having thus examined the Principles of this little Treatise so far as they fall under our present Debate, it will be no hard matter to discover the Fraud and Hypocrisie of his Discourse p. 47. which deserves a distinct Consideration.

The question between us is, Whether the denial of the Principles (charged on the Roman Catholicks) be a sufficient Justification of their Innocence? This

This Author seems to joyn with us in a just abhorrence of them.

[ *Let those in Gods Name, if any there be, of what Religion soever, who hold such Tenents, suffer for them; why should the Innocent be involved with the Guilty? There is neither Reason nor Justice in it.* ]

I confess the Design of dividing the Papists, and making a difference between men of loyal and disloyal Principles is very charitable; even great and good men are apt to believe that to be practicable, which they earnestly desire, and I know none which would not be glad to see a prudent and safe way found out, for making a discrimination between the *Innocent and the Guilty*.

But the Dispute among those of our Church is not whether there be any Loyal and Honest men of the *Roman* Communion; nor yet whether they deserve more Favour than other Papists; but whether we can find out a safe and certain way to distinguish between men of Honest and Seditious Principles?

It is agreed on both sides;

1. That there are some good men of that Communion.
2. That the Righteous ought not to be as the Wicked.
3. That we can have no security from

K

the

the Principles of their Religion.

Those very persons who are for dividing the Papists acknowledge, That  
 'none of them can be truly good and loyal, but  
 'such in whom common reason or common  
 'Christianity prevail above their Religion;  
 'that all the Reason we can have to believe that  
 'they will do us no hurt, if they are truly  
 'conscientious persons, is only this; That  
 'we may hope they do not yet know their  
 'Churches Sense in this matter; at present  
 'they do not know the repugnancy between  
 'their Duty to Princes, and the Principles  
 'of their Communion.

And if so, how we shall discover whether these men think themselves more obliged to their Duty to their King and Country, than to the Judgment and Interest of their Church, I am yet to learn.

But I cannot (without too great a digression) enter upon this Debate, which would afford matter enough for an entire Discourse.

And yet I cannot pass by a very plausible pretence, which some *Roman* Catholics of late have very much insisted upon, to vindicate themselves and their Religion.

A *Roman* Catholique Peer maintain'd a Distinction (some years ago) in the House of Lords between the Catholics of the Church, and those of the Court of *Rome*,  
 part



part of whose Speech I will here transcribe. *My Lords, Give me leave to remind you what kind of Catholick I am; that is a Catholick of the Church of Rome, not a Catholick of the Court of Rome: A distinction (if I am not much deceived) worthy of your memory and reflexion, whenever any severe Proceedings against those whom you call Papists shall come in question, since Catholicks of the Court of Rome do only deserve that Name.* (H)

(H) E. of Bristol's Speech in the House of Peers March 15. 1673.

The Publisher of his Lordships Speech refers us to the Dedication of *Peter Walsh* his History for a Proof of the Reasonableness of this Distinction. And if this Distinction be just and reasonable, (as they say it is) then it must be acknowledged, that a man may be a true Son of the *Roman Church*; that he may understand and act according to the Principles of that Religion, and yet abhor the Abominations of the Court of *Rome*, of its Adherents and Flatterers. I am therefore obliged to examine the Grounds of this Distinction, because it is inconsistent with the Principles laid down in the beginning of this Treatise: For though I do not involve every person of the *Romish Religion* in the guilt of those horrid Doctrines and practises; yet I charge them on the *Roman Church*, and all such as both understand and act in conformity to her Principles.

I have perused and considered the Dedication of *F. Walsb* his Book; and yet I cannot see, that we are beholden to that Church for the Goodness and Loyalty of any *Roman* Catholicks, but either to their Lukewarmness in Religion, or to their Ignorance of the natural Tendency of its Principles; either to the prevalence of common Reason and Christianity, or of their natural Dispositions above their Religion. Nor can I understand what they mean by the Church of *Rome* distinct from the Court, where this Church is to be found: What Judge of Controversies she hath established, what Judicatory she hath erected, to which an Appeal may be made from the Court of *Rome*; or how they can maintain an external Communion with the Church, if they lye under the Censures of the Court of *Rome*? I speak of such times, when no General Council is to be had, and (according to the present constitution of the *Roman* Church) we are not like to see another so long as the World endures. But waving these difficulties, I shall endeavour to make the whole Matter obvious to a common Understanding. Let us therefore put that very Case which we find in the Dedication of *F. Walsb* his History.

It is too evident from the Dedication and History of his Remonstrance, that they which offer his Majesty the least Pledge

Pledge of their Duty and Allegiance are in danger of being Censured, and (as much as lies in the Court of Rome) cast out of the Communion of the Church.

\* The Irish Remonstrance was condemned in formal Terms as Unlawful, Detestable, Sacrilegious, yea in effect as Schismatical and Heretical by the publick Letters of the Intervention's, and of the Roman Cardinals de propaganda Fide. They have not ceased for many years last past to persecute and defame the few remaining constant Ecclesiastical Subscribers; they have kept them in continual chace with Monitories, Citations, Depositions, Excommunications, and even publick affixion or Posting of them. Of all which there was no Cause pretended, but a manifest Design to force them to renounce their Allegiance. (1)

(1) F. Walsh Ep. Ded. p. 2, 3.

And though some Romanists in Ireland continued Loyal to the King during the late Rebellion in these Kingdoms; yet they were all Excommunicated for their Honesty by the Popes Nuntio and his Irish Clergy; (L) And that Sentence being judicially ratified at Rome, we were very lately assur'd, that many of them then continued under it. (M)

(L) The Popes Bull against the Loyal Irish Catholics was dated Rome Aug. 2<sup>o</sup> 1665.

1665. by which they are required to do publick Penance to their Obedience to the King. Walsh Ep. Ded. p. 31. 32.

(M) Considerations touching the true way to suppress P. &c. (Ed. 1677.) p. 44.

Besides, The Author of the Controversial Letters (in his 8th. Letter) acknowledges, *'That the Court of Rome and its Dependents are so diligent in suppressing all Books written against the Popes Power; that a private man cannot write without hazard of a Censure on his Book, and possibly on his Person.* Were not Barclay and Widdrington formerly condemned at Rome for opposing the Popes Power of Deposing Princes? And have not those few English and Irish Writers, (which have since had the boldness to speak the Truth) been branded and censured for that unpardonable Crime?

And now I shall bring this whole Matter to a short Issue.

I. The Church Diffusive is no Body Politick, nor can do any Act as such: It can neither judge of Persons or Causes but as assembled in a Council; and what if a General Council (after all the Complaints of the injured Parties) be hindered or deferred for many years; and for many more sometimes assembled, sometimes dissolved, as the Council of Trent was? During the Intervals of Councils, there is no Authority that doth or can act in contradiction to the Court of Rome; for neither the Church Representative, nor the Authentick Laws of the Church have entrusted any Judicatory (Independent on  
that

that Court) with the Exposition or Execution of the Canons and Decrees of the Church. No Council can be called but by the Popes Authority; (N) And in the Intervals of Councils all matters of Im-

(N) Decret.  
par. 1. dist. 17.  
c. 5. The Title  
is, *Non est Con-*  
*cilium, sed Con-*

*venticulum, quod sine sedis Apostolicæ auctoritate celebratur.*

(O) Decret. par. 1. Dist. 17. c. 5. *Maiores virò & difficiliore*  
*questiones ( ut sancta Synodus statuit & beata consuetudo exigit ) ad*  
*sedem Apostolicam semper referantur.*

I know the Council of Constance decreed, That General Councils should for ever be held once in ten years, and made (as they thought) a sufficient Provision for the Observation of that Canon; (P) but how easily the Court of Rome hath e-

(P) Concil.  
Constant. sess.  
39. p. 577.  
(tom. 29.) *De*  
*Conciliis Gene-*  
*ralibus & pro-*

*visione erga futura schismata. — quem terminum liceat summo Pon-*  
*tifici de fratrum suorum S. R. Ecclesie Cardinalium Consilio ob emer-*  
*gentes sorté casus abbreviare, (sed nullatenus prorogetur.*

2. Suppose a General Council should be called, yet (according to present Constitution of the Roman Church) it cannot act in opposition to the Court of Rome. For, not to insist on the great Numbers of Monks and Friars, of Canonists, and such like Creatures and Vassals of the Papacy, with which their Councils are filled; all the Bishops (who have Decisive Votes

in Councils) are under an Oath of as absolute Allegiance to the Pope, as any Subject in Christendom is to his Natural Prince. For proof hereof I appeal both to the *Roman Pontifical*, (where the Oath is to be seen (Q) ) and to *F. Walsb* himself, to whom the Catholicks of the Church of *Rome* refer us. (R) They are bound by this Oath, to observe (at least) all the Canons that are already set forth and enjoined; and are not many of those Canons destructive of the Rights of Princes? Is there the least notice taken in this Oath of the Obedience due to them?

(Q) *Pontif.*  
Rom. p. 59, 60.

(R) *F. walsb*  
in the Dedic-  
ation of his Hi-  
story p. 19. All  
the Bishops  
bind them-  
selves (at their  
Consecration )  
Liege-men to

his Holiness, by the strictest Oath that could be sworn or penn'd, especially being the Pope himself is the only Interpreter thereof.

See also the History, part 1. p. 513.

In this Oath (among other things) they swear to defend the *Roman* Papacy, and the Regalities of *St. Peter*; to observe with all their might the Rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolical Decrees and Commands; (by which are undoubtedly meant the Popes Canons and Commands.)

And though the Papal Usurpations have been for some Ages lamented and complained of by the better part of the Christian World, yet the Church of *Rome* hath not used any effectual means to prevent them, as she was bound both in Prudence and Conscience to do, if she had no mind to let the Pope keep up their Pretensions to them. Besides, when it was desired, that the Pope would dispence with this Oath at the Council of *Trent*, and

and leave the Bishops to the freedom of their Consciences, the Motion was rejected, as not only F. *Paul*, but Cardinal *Palavizine* himself acknowledges. (S)

(S) *Pallavi. Hist. Conc. Trid. Tom. 2. p. 366. 367. (Ed. 1670.)*

3. If any Decrees of General Councils should chance to prove prejudicial to the Papacy; they shall signifie no more than his Holiness please. For if the Pope think fit to dispense with them, or to interpret them according to his own mind, who can help it? Was not the Order of the Jesuites set up against a Decree of one of their General Councils? (T) Are not all men (by the Laws of the Church) bound to resort to the Pope for the Sense of their Decrees? (V)

(T) *Bullar. Cherub. tom. 1. p. 654. Paul the third in his Bull of ap-*

probation of that Order hath this expression; *Non obstantibus Generalis Concilii, & Felicitis recordationis Gregorii Pape 10. ac quibuscumque aliis Constitutionibus & Ordinationibus Apostolicis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscunque.* The Council to which he refers is that of Lateran under Innocent the third; c. 13. *De Nova Religionibus prohibitis*, where 'tis expressly said, *firmiter prohibemus, ne quis de cetero novam Religionem inveniat, &c.*

(V) *Decret. par. 1. dist. 17. c. 4. Quoties aliqua de universali Synoda aliquibus dubitatio nascitur, ad recipiendam de eo quod non intelligant rationem, aut sponte ii qui salutem animæ suæ disiderant, ad Apostolicam sedem pro recipienda ratione conveniant, aut si forte ita obstinati & contumaces extiterint, &c.*

4. To put this matter out of all doubt I add, That whatever pretences there might be for this Distinction between the Church and Court of Rome before the Coun-

Council of *Trent* ; yet they are utterly destroyed by that Great Oracle of the present *Roman Church*. For the Fathers of that Council tamely gave up the Cause , betrayed their own and their Churches Liberties , abetted the Usurpations of the Court of *Rome* , took away the Legality of Appeals from that Court to a General Council , and the Superiority of their own Power to that of the Papacy ; they enjoined all the Beneficed Clergy to take an Oath of Obedience to the Pope , made him the Judge and Interpreter of all their Decrees , provided that all Writers should either speak for the Court of *Rome* , or be silent.

What was the Issue of this goodly Convention , but the confirming the Pope in his Usurped Power , the enslaving the Consciences of the Clergy , and leaving the whole Christian World ( of that Communion ) under an impossibility of ever having a Free General Council ? (X)

(X) History  
of the Church  
of *Trent* by

F. Paul I. 8. an. 1563.

*Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. Decret. de Ref. c. 2. c. 5. c. 21. Et lib. prohibet. reg. 10. &c.*

And Card. Pallavizine Hist. *Conc. Trid.* tom. 2. p. 367.

And



And now let al Wise and Impartial men judge, whether the Distinction between the Church and Court of *Rome* be not utterly insignificant, as to those purposes, for which it is commonly produced ?

[ Object. Hereunto some Persons stick not to say, That Dispensations, and I know not what Indulgences and Pardons, whereby to legitimate the Crimes of Lying and Forswearing, when the Interest of our Church requires it, are a main part of our Religion; and by Consequence the Denial of our Principles is no sufficient Justification of our Innocence. ]

I have not leisure to discourse of their Dispensations, Indulgences and Pardons; But that Dispensations have been granted from *Rome* to legitimate these Horrid Crimes we are assured by Persons of unquestionable Credit.

Whether the Generality of the *English* Papists in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, had any Dispensations for the Dissembling their Religion, and coming to our Churches, I know not; but not long after 'The very Dispensations were intercepted in Scotland, and shewed to the King; by which they were allowed to Promise, Swear, Subscribe,

(Y) *Spotswoods*  
History of the  
Church of  
Scotland, ad  
an. 1580.  
p. 308.

'scribe, and do what else should be required  
'of them, so as in Mind they continued  
'firm, and did use their Diligence to ad-  
'vance in secret the Roman Faith. (Y)  
And sure it was not without Reason  
on the Irish Remonstrants part, That  
they left out that Clause in their For-  
mulary (which was contained in the  
Oath of Allegiance,) viz. *That the Pope*  
*cannot dispense with this Oath.*

(Z) History of  
the Council of  
Trent, l. 8.

We know, no less Person than *Lay-  
nez* (the General of the Jesuites) de-  
clared in the Council of Trent, 'That  
'to say the Pope cannot by Dispensations  
'disoblige him, who is Obligated before God,  
'is to teach men to prefer their own Con-  
'science before the Authority of the Church  
(Z) And *Laynez* was so far from be-  
ing call'd to an Account for that bold  
Assertion, that he was Honoured and  
highly complimented by the Fathers of  
that Council.

In short, The Bishops of *Rome* have  
presumed to alter the Nature of Things,  
to absolve in some Cases from the O-  
bedience of God himself; to grant Par-  
dons for the greatest Sins against the  
Divine Majesty, and to License Ince-  
stuous Marriages against the Law of  
God and Nature.

But

But the *High-Priest* did not use to let out *Goliath's Sword* but upon Extraordinary Occasions; It may be these Dispensations are not very commonly and frequently sent over hither, for many Papists do not need them; some are not fit to be trusted with them; and 'tis not always for the Interest of the *Roman Church* and Religion to grant them.

---



---

CHAP. VI.

*Of the late Lord Staffords Declaration and Address to the House of Peers, concerning a Comprehension for the Dissenting Protestants, and a Toleration for the Papists.*

1. *Of the Comprehension for the Dissenting Protestants.*

*Three Propositions concerning Comprehension.*

*'Tis neither the Duty nor Interest of any Roman Catholicks (continuing true to their Principles) to promote a firm and lasting Union of Protestants.*

*What Influence the Romish Agents had on the first Separation from our Church.*

*Of the late Declaration of Indulgence,*

2. *Of the Toleration for the Papists.*

*Of their endeavours to procure a Toleration under Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, the late Usurped Powers, and his present Majesty.*

*What*

*What the Design of that Faction is in endeavouring to procure a Toleration.*

*They have been the worse for Favour and Indulgence, as is evident from their Behaviour towards Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, and his present Majesty.*

*This Chapter concluded with the Protestation of King Charles the First.*

[P. 52, §3. **M**<sup>T</sup> Lords Declaration before the House of Lords after his Condemnation.

*That there had been at divers times endeavours used, and Overtures made to obtain an Abrogation, or at least a Mitigation of Severities against Catholicks, but this to be procured no otherwise, than by Legal and Parliamentary means. That he himself went to Breda, whilst the King was there, and propounded 100000 l. in behalf of the Catholicks, to take off the Penal Laws: That after the King came in, there was a Bill brought into the House, in Favour of Catholicks, but it was opposed by my Lord Chancellor Hide. (With some later Proposals and Expedients, &c.) These he avouched were the chief, and only Designs he ever had, or knew*

knew of amongst Catholics, for promoting their Religion.]

[ In his former Address to the Court p. 41. he declared ; That it was ever indeed his Opinion, that an Act of Comprehension for Dissenting Protestants, and a Toleration for Roman Catholics (yet so as not to admit them into any Offices of Profit or Dignity ) would much conduce to the Happiness of the Nation ; but this not otherwise to be procured or desired, than by a free Consent of the King, Lords, and Commons, in Parliament assembled: That he never read or knew of Coleman's Letters or Consultations for Tolerations till he saw the Letters themselves in the Printed Tryal. ]

[ In the Printed Tryal p. 201. My Lords, I believe that after that all of all Religions had Meetings amongst themselves to endeavour to get that Toleration which they proposed humbly to your Lordships, there I will never deny, that my Opinion was, and is, That this Kingdom can never be happy till an Act of Parliament pass to this effect: It was my Opinion then, and I did endeavour it all I could that the Dissenting Protestants might have a Comprehension, and the other (those of the Church of Rome) a Toleration. ]

But how comes a zealous Papist to have so much kindness for Dissenting Protestants? Were I a Dissenting Protestant, I

L

should

should very hardly be persuaded, That those men, which (ever since the Reformation) have endeavour'd to undermine the Foundations of our Religion, are now become Friends to the Protestant Interest. I should call to mind Coleman's Declaration after Sentence given against him; That possibly he might be of an Opinion, that Popery might come in, if Liberty of Conscience had been granted.

I should be afraid of helping to break in pieces the established Religion and Government; lest when they have gotten the Power into their Hands, they should betake themselves to their old Arguments of Fire and Fagot.

But to return, I shall take occasion from his Lordships Declaration, to give a brief Account of the Comprehension for Dissenting Protestants, and the Toleration for the *Roman* Catholicks, so far as they of the *Romish* Party are concerned in them.

I. I begin with the *Comprehension for Dissenting Protestants.*

If by Comprehension be meant such a Settlement, as tendeth to a firm and lasting Union of Protestants; and is consistent with the Security of the Reformed Religion, the Honour of our first Reformers, and the establishment of the Church of



of *England*; in short, such a Settlement as may shew that the present Terms of Communion with our Church are not unlawful; I say, if this be the meaning of Comprehension, let it be considered.

1. That Private Persons (of how great Eminency soever) can only make Proposals to their Lawful Superiors, for the Laws are still in force, and cannot be altered by any Authority less than that by which they were Enacted.

2. That divers very Eminent Persons of the Church of *England* have made the most fair and equal Proposals for the Satisfaction of all wise and peaceable men, which are consistent with the Honour and Safety of the best established Church in Christendom.

3. Since the Alteration of the Established Laws (concerning the Preservation of our Church and Religion) is one of the weightiest Considerations in the World; since it is impossible to gain all Parties without receding too far from the first Principles of the Reformation; there is something to be done by the Dissenters before they can reasonably hope for an Alteration of the present Constitutions: I mean, it should be known what kind of Alteration is desired, and for whom, what

sort of men will be gained by it, and what number of them?

When they which make such loud outcries and passionate Expostulations for *Union* have gone thus far; then may our Governours understand what Measures are fittest to be taken; *i. e.* Whether it be expedient to make any Alterations; and if it be, how far to Alter for the sake of Peace and a firm *Union of Protestants*? Private Persons may judge of the Lawfulness of things imposed by Authority; but it is an Argument of Pride and Immodesty for private persons to think themselves Competent Judges of the necessity or expediency of Laws.

(A) See the Letter of Advice given to F. Young, concerning the best way of managing the Popish Interest in England upon his Majesties Restauration. The first

Advice is, To make the Obstruction of Settlement the great Design, especially upon the Fundamental Constitution of the Kingdom.

The Letter is cited by the Dean of *S. Pauls* in his Preface to the Unreasonableness of Separation.

tempts

tempts have been more frequent, so they have been carried on with more Art and Industry, than against any Church in the Christian World. A Church that is free from Impostures and Innovations, from Superstition and Enthusiasm, which are the principal Ingredients of Popery. A Church that endeavours to reduce all things to their Antient Limits; and so long there can be no room for Papal Usurpations. And I appeal to all wise men, Whether it be either the Interest or Duty of the *Romish* Faction, (continuing true to their Principles) to strengthen or repair such a Church as this, which they are bound to pull down or break in pieces? All the Service that I could ever find they did the Church of *England* was to raise and support Sects and Factions amongst us, to creep in among them under various disguises; to weaken the Government, to lay us open to the Assaults of Foreign and Domestick Enemies, and to bring us into such a disorder and confusion as was more likely to end in Atheism or Popery, than in the *Union of Protestants*.

If we look back as far as the first beginning of the Separation from our Church, we shall see many strong probabilities, that the busie Factors for Popery (the Jesuites and Jesuited Papists) had a great Influence on it; and what advantages they have ever since made of our unnatural Heats and growing Schisms, we are not

wholly ignorant. They knew the safest (though not the quickest) way to reduce their Religion, was by somenting domestic Factions; And when some of the Exiles (in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign) returned home with a dislike of some things in our Church, they laid hold of this Opportunity of dividing the Protestants, and enflamed the differences in hope of making them destroy one another and fall a Prey to the common Adversary. ‘*Whilest Harding, Sanders, and others (of the Roman Communion) attacked our Church on one side; (saith a learned and faithful Historian) Coleman, Butten, Hallingham and others were as busie on the other.*

And it hath been lately published to the world, (from the Lord *Burleighs* Papers) that *Faithful Commin* a Dominican Friar, and *Thomas Heath* (a Jesuite) were employed by the Pope and Jesuites under the disguise of zealous Protestants to draw men off from the Communion of the Church of *England*. Such wonderful Friends are the Emissaries of *Rome* to order and unite amongst *English* Protestants!

But I will conclude this Head with the *Declaration of Indulgence An. 167 $\frac{1}{2}$* ; concerning which the Author of the *Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country* tells us, That ‘*when the War was*

'to be made with Holland, the Lord C. advised to quiet all Dissenters in Religion at home, with granting the Declaration of Indulgence; and the E. of S. though a man of Principles and Interest opposite to the other, presently closed with his Advice.

And Coleman own'd that the 'Fatal Revocation of this Declaration for Liberty of Conscience was that to which the Papists owed all their late Miseries and Hazards. We all know that from this time Licenses were accepted, and Meeting-houses built; People were withdrawn from the Parochial Assemblies, and Books written to justify their Practices upon such Principles, as naturally lead to endless Separations, and the destroying the very being of our Church: Whole Herds of Priests and Jesuites have lurked in these Kingdoms, and the Roman Church hath had a most plentiful Harvest amongst us. If this be called the *Uniting of Protestants*, it must be by the same Figure, by which the destroying mens Rights is call'd the defending their Liberties.

2. I come to consider the Endeavours which have been used by the *Roman Catholics* to procure a Toleration for themselves.

At Queen Elizabeth's first coming to the Crown the Pope threatned to Excommunicate her; the Emperor and other

(B) Cambden Foreign Princes moved by their Ambassadors for a free and open Exercise of the Roman Catholick Religion. (B)  
 Eliz. ad an.  
 1558.

In King James his time Cardinal Bellarmine roundly tells his Majesty, *'That if he desired to consult his own and his Peoples Safety, he must give Liberty to their Religion.* (C)

(C) Bel. Resp.  
 at Apol. (Ed.  
 Col. Agripp.  
 1610.) p. 21.

*Sic Rex secura regnare, & vitæ suæ ac suorum consulere cupit, sinat Catholicos frui antiqua possessione religionis suæ.*

And the Lord Herbert in a Letter to the King An. 1623. tells him; *'The Pope will never grant his Consent to the Marriage of the Prince with the Infanta of Spain, unless his Majesty grant some notable Privileges and Advantages to the Roman Catholics in his Dominions: He adds, The King of Spain would never insist on obtaining these Privileges, but that he desires to form a Party in your Majesties Kingdoms, which he may always keep obsequious to his will, &c.* (D)

(D) Cahala.  
 printed 1654.

In the beginning of King Charles the First his Reign, the Irish Papists taking advantage of the Emptiness of the Kings Treasury, proffered to maintain Five Thousand men at their own Charge, if they might enjoy a Toleration; but that Motion was crushed by the Bishops. The Project failing in Ireland, the English Papists offer'd (but with no better Success) to buy

buy the free Exercise of their Religion at the expence of maintaining a certain proportion of Ships. (E)

(E) *Fullers Church History*, l. 11. p. 128, 129.

It is well known how that restless Faction fed their Disciples with continual expectations of a Change, and though these two Excellent and Pious Princes did inviolably maintain the established Protestant Religion, yet they gained this mighty Advantage, that notwithstanding all the Writings and Speeches, Declarations and Protestations of King *James* against Popery, the Fears and Jealousies of his Subjects (occasioned only by some short Relaxations) were never cured in his days. And in the Reign of King *Charles* the First, whatever Indulgence either the Gentleness of his own Disposition prompted him to, or the necessity of his Affairs extorted from him, was looked upon as the Effect of his Majesties Inclination to Popery. For though the War was raised by discontented, covetous, and ambitious men, and carried on by a leading Faction, yet it was necessary to make Religion a Stalking Horse to their Interest; and the Imputation of Popery was the great Engine, by which they rendred the King and his Adherents odious, and robb'd him of the Hearts of his People; for by this Suggestion they abused the credulity of many well-meaning (but intemperate) Zealots; persuaded them to engage in the Defence of the Protestant

stant Religion, and kept others so long from his Majesties Assistance, till they too late saw and lamented their own weakness, and the Treachery of a lesser but more active party, whom they had followed *in the Simplicity of their hearts.*

(F) *Englands*  
Complaint,  
p. 17, 18.

Not long before the Murder of the King, many Jesuits and other Priests daily flocked into this Kingdom, and so far insinuated themselves into some prime Commanders of the Army and others of the House of Commons (then at the Devotion of the Army) that they were in a fair way to obtain their share in that Toleration or Liberty of Conscience which was so agreeable to the Judgment of the Times, as Mr. Gaisford saith upon his own immediate knowledge. (F) And Mr. Prinne (in the Appendix to his forecited Speech) tells us, that after the Army had imprisoned and removed his Majesty to bring him to Tryal, *'They voted at their General Council of War (carried by two Voices,) That the Papists should have Free Liberty and Toleration of Conscience, and all Sequestrations and Forfeitures as Papists only, taken off.'*

Under the Usurped Powers they offer'd to renounce their Loyalty and Allegiance to the Royal Family for ever, upon condition of a free Toleration of their Religion: And certainly those times of disorder



der and confusion gave them a mighty advantage for the re-establishing their Religion in *England*, when Episcopacy was voted down; (and 'tis well known what rejoicing that Vote brought to the Romish party) the Defender of the Faith put to death; (and we are not ignorant with what Joy and Triumph the news of his death was received in the English Convents and Seminaries) The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy repealed, and it was put to the Vote in the Little Parliament, Whether all the Parochial Ministers should not be put down at once?

What endeavours have been used since his Majesties Happy Restauration to procure or purchase a Toleration, Mr. *Coleman* and the late Lord *Stafford* have informed us.

And yet some men ask, Why may not *Roman* Catholicks enjoy the Freedom of their Consciences and Religion?

But they have never read, or never considered *Colemans* Tryal, and the Collection of Letters lately published. What made him lament the *Fatal Revocation of the Declaration for Liberty of Conscience*? What is the meaning of such Expressions as these; 'That if they could carry the Design of getting an Act for Liberty of Conscience, they should in effect do what they list afterwards? That the prevailing in these things

‘ things would give the greatest blow to the  
 ‘ Protestant Religion here, that ever it recei-  
 ‘ ved since its Birth? That they had a migh-  
 ‘ ty Work upon their hands, no less than the  
 ‘ Conversion of three Kingdoms; and by that  
 ‘ perhaps the subduing of a Pestilent Heresie,  
 ‘ which had domineer’d over a great part of  
 ‘ the Northern World a long time? (G)

(G) And yet  
 the Author of  
*Staffords Me-*

*moirs*, (p. 10.) would persuade us, That the Letters of Mr. Cole-  
 man and others do only shew, that they desired perhaps in some  
 measure a Liberty of Conscience; yet without confronting, much  
 less destroying the King or Government.

And the Lord *Stafford* himself acknow-  
 ledged before the House of Peers, ‘ That  
 ‘ if he had known any such Design, as Cole-  
 ‘ mans Letters do hint, he would not have  
 ‘ continued in England. (H)

(H) See the  
 Printed Tryal  
 p. 292.

How miserably then are those poor  
 men imposed upon, that think the De-  
 sign ( at least of the Active Men ) of this  
 Faction was meerly to enjoy the Freedom  
 of their Consciences, or the private Ex-  
 ercise of their Religion? It is not the  
 Ease of their own Consciences, but a  
 Power to lay insupportable Burthens on  
 other mens Consciences which they aim  
 at. What they call Indulgence and To-  
 leration is indeed Rule and Dominion;  
 they first strengthen their own party, and  
 weaken the Established Religion and Go-  
 vrnment by all the Arts of Fraud and  
 Treachery

Treachery ; and when they have once gotten the Power into their Hands, they deprive all others of the Enjoyment of their Religion and Consciences ; and this is notorious in all places where they have had Strength and Opportunity to compass their Designs.

Indeed some good-natur'd People are willing to believe, that they are a very harmless and peaceable sort of Creatures ; and others ( that pretend to some kind of Insight into Mysteries of State ) look upon an Indulgence as the best way to oblige and make them sure to the Government.

But it were no hard matter to prove that the former are very much mistaken in their Charity, and the latter in their Politicks. All the Connivence and Favours of our Princes (since the Reformation) have been so far from making them true to the Crown, that they have always been the worse for Indulgence.

In the beginning of Queen Elizabeths Reign, she treated them with the greatest Mercy and Clemency, which had dealt most Insolently and Cruelly with her before she came to the Crown. ' For the first ten years of her Majesty ( by the ' Confession of the Secular Priests ) (1) the ' State of Catholicks in England was tolerable, and after a Sort in some good quietness,

(1) Important Considerations, &c.

*ness. Parsons and Creswel (the Jesuites) tell her Majesty, 'That in the beginning of her Kingdom, she dealt something more gently with Catholicks; that none were then urged by her, or pressed either to her Sect, or to the denial of their Faith; all things seemed to proceed in a far milder course, no great Complaints were heard of.*

*Yea her Majesty suffered Bonner (that Man of Blood) after all his Butcheries, quietly to live and dye amongst us; Heath to live securely at his own House in Surrey; Tonstall, Thirlby and Fecknam to live in ease and freedom; she reserved Pensions to such of the Popish Clergy, as quitted their Benefices by Resignation. (L)*

(L) Hist. of the Reformation, part. 2. p. 396. &c.

*In Fine, some Roman Catholicks were highly obliged, none provoked by any greater Severity than the requiring of 12 d. a Sunday for not coming to Church; and yet they were continually giving fresh Proofs of their Loyalty and Gratitude to the Queen, by dispersing of Libels against her Person, Crown and Dignity; procuring of Bulls from Rome, fomenting of Treasons and Conspiracies at home, or tampering with the King of Spain to invade her Majesties Dominions, as (besides our Writers) their own Secular Priests do acknowledge. (M)*

(M) Important Confessions, &c.

King

King *James* at his first coming to the Crown of *England*, was so far from putting the Laws in Execution against the Papists, that he remitted the Arrears of their Penalties in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, and pardoned divers of the Conspirators; he suffer'd them to enjoy their Estates and Consciences, and admitted divers of them to Places of Trust and Honour. But for a Testimony of their prodigious Ingratitude, I refer you to that Royal Author.

The King himself avowed it to the whole Christian World, *'That such was his Mercy and Clemency to them, as not only the Papists grew to that height of Pride, in confidence of his Mildness, as they did directly expect, and assuredly promise to themselves Liberty of Conscience, and Equality with other of his Subjects in all things; but even a Number of the best and faithfullest of his Majesties Subjects, were cast in great Fear and Amazement of his Course and Proceedings, ever Prognosticating and justly Suspecting that Sowre Fruit to come of it, which shewed it self clearly in the Powder Treason.'*

*'How many did I honour with Knighthood (they are his Majesties own Words) of known and open Recusants? How indifferently did I give Audience and Access to both sides, bestowing equally all Favours and Honours on both Professions? How free and continual Access had all Ranks and*

(N) King  
James his  
Works, p. 253.

‘and Degrees of Papists in my Court and  
‘Company? How frankly and freely did I  
‘free Recusants of their Ordinary Pay-  
‘ments? — My General Pardon extend-  
‘ed to all convicted Priests in Prison, where-  
‘upon they are set at Liberty as good Sub-  
‘jects; and all Priests that were taken af-  
‘ter, were sent over and set at Liberty there,  
‘(after a Proclamation, That all Priests  
‘that were at Liberty might go out of the  
‘Country by such a Day.) But time and  
‘Paper will fail me to make Enumeration of  
‘all the Benefits and Favours that I bestowed  
‘in general and particular upon Papists; in  
‘recounting whereof every Scrape of my Pen  
‘would serve but for a Blot of the Popes In-  
‘gratitude and Injustice in meeting me with  
‘so hard a measure for the same. (N)

Grant them an Indulgence; they will  
move for an open Toleration. Give them  
a Toleration, they will aspire to an E-  
quality with other (Protestant) Subjects;  
and then all the Art and Policy of Rome  
shall be employed to get the Power into  
their own hands.

I know nothing that could exasperate  
them under King Charles the First, his  
Majesties Goodness and Clemency to them  
gave occasion to a wicked and malicious  
Imputation, of his being *popishly affected*,  
and what requital they made his Sacred  
Majesty I have already shew’d.

Since

Since his Majesties Blessed Restauration, they have enjoyed as great a measure of Peace and Liberty, as ever any People did under a Prince of a different Religion. As his Majesty was very tender of their Lives and Fortunes, so his Protestant Subjects have been so far from thirsting after their Blood, that they never gave them any disturbance which was not necessary for their own Safety, till the breaking out of Plots and Designs against the Government awakened the sleeping Laws. Let us appeal to the Testimony of the late Lord *Stafford*; his words (in the printed Tryal p. 200.) are, ‘ Since his Majesties ‘ Happy Restauration I do conceive, and I ‘ think I may safely say it (for you all know ‘ he was Gracious and Good to all Dissenters, ‘ particularly to them of the Romish Church) ‘ they had Connivence and Indulgence in their ‘ Private Houses, and I declare to your Lord- ‘ ships, I did then say to some that were too open ‘ in their Worship, that they did play foul in ‘ taking more liberty upon them than was sit- ‘ ting for them too, and that brought the ‘ Misfortune upon me which I will not name.

And now a man might wonder at the continual and loud Complaints of Persecution for their Religion and Consciences; and their Restless Endeavours to procure Liberty of Conscience (as they call it) by any Means, at any Price. If ever they wanted Liberty since the

M

Refor-

Reformation, they may thank themselves for it: They have generally enjoyed the Private Exercise of their Religion; but this is not the meaning of *Liberty of Conscience* in the stile of our times.

From these Instances it is evident, That if Kindness and Lenity were the way to oblige the *Roman* Catholicks of these Kingdoms, we had never heard of a *Spanish Armada*, a *Gunpowder Treason*; of an *Irish Rebellion*, or of a *Plot against his Sacred Majesty*, whom God long preserve; they would have been indeed (what they falsely pretend to be) His Majesties *Loyal and Dutiful Subjects*. But I wish they had not taken an effectual Course by the many Conspiracies within this last hundred Years, and by this of equal or greater Horror than the rest, to convince us how easily a Popish Zeal can break through all Obligations of Religion and Gratitude.

I will conclude this Chapter with the Judgment of our late Royal Martyr, concerning these men and their Religion.

*An. 1642. he call'd God to Witness, ' That he would never Consent, upon what ' Pretence soever, to a Toleration of the Popish Profession, or Abolition of Laws then in force against the Recusants.*

This



( 163 )

This Solemn Protestation was made by his Majesty, who had too much reason to understand their Tempers and Principles; and though I find it quoted by his Enemies, yet I cannot meet with any Proof that ever he alter'd his Mind in this Matter.

---

M 2

CHAR

The solemn Protestation was made  
by his Majesty, who had so much rea-  
son to understand their Tempors and  
Principles; and though I had in general  
by his Majesty, yet I cannot meet with  
any Place that ever he said I mis-  
understood.

## CHAP. VII.

*A short Reflection on the foregoing Discourse.*

*Some things offered to all such as desire to prevent the Designs of the Papists.*

1. *Beware of Seditious Doctrines and Practises.*

*A brief Account of them.*

*This Consideration recommended to all Protestants; especially to the Dissenters from the Established Church of England.*

*Of the Secluded Members; and of the Solemn League and Covenant.*

2. *Beware of being Instrumental to the weakning or subverting of the Church of England.*

*Popery can never enter into our Church so long as the Established Articles, Liturgy and Government are maintained.*

*The Difference between the Ceremonies of the Church of Rome and those of the Church of England.*

*Three Considerations to them that charge our Church and Episcopal*

*Clergy with Inclining to Popery.  
Some other things propounded to the  
Dissenters by way of Considera-  
tion and Advice.*

*The Conclusion of the whole.*

**T**HUS far I have endeavoured to lay open the Mystery of Iniquity and Rebellion, as it hath been carried on under a pretence of Zeal for God and Religion.

I have fairly represented those Doctrines and Principles which strike at the very root of our Established Religion and Government ; with the Arts and Instruments which have been used by the prevailing Faction of the *Roman Church* for the Subversion of them. And I know no stronger Argument against the Truth and Goodness of any Religion, than that it supplants Moral Righteousness and serves to be a Bond of Conspiracy ; allows of Sedition and Treachery, Injustice and Cruelty. For how can that Religion be from God, which maketh Men unlike to God ; as bad or worse than if they were left to the Principles and Inclinations of their own Natures ?

I have proved, That there are no Doctrines or Rules of the Reformed Religion which enjoyn or countenance any Seditious or Bloody Practises for the Propagation of it ; and there is no reason why  
those

those Faults of Ill Men should be imputed to Religion, which proceed either from the Ignorance or the Want of it.

The True Reformed (i. e. Christian) Religion is the strongest Bond of Humane Society, the best Friend in the World to Civil Government; 'tis a better Security to the Throne of a King than all his Treasures and Magazines, all his Guards and Armies: It never licensed any Treasons or Murders, any Insurrections or Massacres, though it were for the best Ends, for God and Religion; and why should such a Religion suffer in our esteem for the Doctrines or Actions of men, which under the disguise of Zeal against Popery have weakened the Reformation?

Of the Church of *England* I will only say; It hath established the Right of Kings upon such sure and unalterable Foundations, that it is the Interest as well as the Duty of the Civil Power to support and defend it,

But I cannot dismiss this Subject without offering some things by way of Consideration and Advice to all such as (out of a just regard to the Honour of God, and the Tranquillity of this Church and Kingdom) desire to prevent the Designs of our Enemies, and transmit the True Religion to Posterity. I speak to Men that have seen or heard of the Ways and Means, by which the Monarchy and

Church of *England* were once overthrown; to men that have felt both the Calamities of an Intestine War, and the Happiness of a long Peace; and therefore I need not trouble the Reader or my self with those things which are fresh in our Memories.

We have of late been alarm'd with the Apprehensions of Popery, and we are loth to put our Necks under that Yoak which our Fathers were not able to bare. But do we detest Popery for the sake of the Church and Kingdom, as well as our own Estates and Liberties? Do we hate Popery for the Immorality as well as the Destructiveness of its Principles? Are we Zealous for the Reformed Religion, because it teaches us to fear God and honour the King; to be just and merciful to our Brethren, humble and obedient to our Lawful Governours? If these be not the Motives of our preferring the Protestant before the *Romish* Religion, we better deserve the name of *Hobbiſts*, than of *Protestants*. Protestants and no Christians! Protestants only because 'tis against our Humour or Interest to be Papists! But if we have indeed a greater regard to our Souls than our Fortunes; if we value the honour and security of our Religion above our temporal Concernments, and the common cause of the Reformation above our private Fancies and Passions; then we shall be infinitely fearful of giving any Advan-  
tages

tages to our Enemies of *Rome*, of serving the Designs of the Papists *really and eventually* (to use the words of a late reverend Author) *though not designedly and intentionally*.

1. Then let us beware of those Seditious Doctrines and Principles which were first set on foot, and have been since kept up by the prevailing Faction of the *Roman Church*. What Doctrines were taught by some of the Popes before the breaking out of an avowed Design for an Universal Monarchy, I have shewed already. But for the last six hundred years, all things have been contrived and carried on for the setting up a Kingdom in the Church, to which all the Princes of the Earth are to submit. The Bishops of *Rome* have usurped upon the Crowns of Kings and Emperors; (under the pretence of a direct or indirect Supremacy over them) Excommunicated and deposed them for Tyranny and Heresie; absolved their Subjects from their Allegiance, and animated them to take up Arms against them. The General Councils of that Church have established Treason by a Law; their Decrees are entred into the Body of the Canon Law, alledged by their Schoolmen, justified by their Divines and Casuists, refined and improved by the Jesuites. And 'tis said, that *Buchanan* transplanted those Antimonarchical Doctrines (which he had learnt of one of these Masters) from the Church

Church into the State; but with this difference only, that he invested the People with that Authority over Princes, which the other had placed in the Pope.

But (to omit many particulars of lesser moment) these are properly Popish Principles and Jesuitical Tenents, and they have been the main Pillars to support the Papal Interest.

*That the Original of all Civil Power is from the People, and derived from them to the Prince by way of Mutual Compact. That a King is the Peoples Trustee, and their duty to him only Conditional. That his Person and Authority are separable; and that the Cognizance of Ecclesiastical Matters belongs not to him. That the Church hath Power to Excommunicate the King, and (in certain Cases) to denounce Sentence of Deprivation against him; that it is lawful for Subjects to enter into Confederacies and take up Arms against him for their Religion and Liberties; and that the Commonwealth may curb and restrain him, bring him to Tryal and Condemn Punishment.*

I can hardly meet with any Seditious Antimonarchical Doctrines, or any specious Arguments to maintain them, in the Pamphlets of the last Forty years, but they are either expressly contained in the Writings of the Popes and Jesuites, or at least may be parallell'd in the approved Divines and Canonists of the Roman Church. Certainly the Enemy hath sown these



these Tares in the Field; (A) The implacable restless Enemy of *Rome* hath cunningly sown these Principles of Sedition amongst us, and industriously fomented such Practises as are consonant to them. (A) *St. Math.* 13. 28;

And now let all men which call themselves Protestants consider, That it was not the least part of the Design of our Reformers, to assert and retrieve the Ancient Rights of the Crown; and how can it be for the Honour of the Reformation, to maintain such Doctrines, as naturally tend to the weakning or subverting that Authority which they Established? They have left us a more holy and peaceable Religion than that of the Papists; and if we would shew our selves *true Protestants*, our Doctrines and Practises must protest against Popery, and prove us better Christians and better Subjects than they.

If you are Protestants of the Church of *England* as it is established amongst us, I need only put you in mind, that you have been Educated in a Faith of Loyalty and Obedience; and you can never be tempted by any the most plausible pretences to desert it, without either forsaking or being false to that Church whereof you are Members.

If you are Dissenters from the Church of *England*, I know not how it can consist with your Zeal against Popery, to contribute

bute any thing towards the breaking in pieces that Government, which you acknowledge the present (as well as former) Designs of the Papists are levelled against. You glory in the Name of Protestants, but where do you find any one Protestant Church in the World, that hath by any publick Act asserted any of these Doctrines?

I speak not either to *Hobbits* and *Libertines*, or to furious and wild Fanaticks, but only to men of Conscience and Sobriety, to such as (I believe) have a real (tho misguided) Zeal for the protestant Religion, for their King and Country: To such as have not forgotten that a War was raised for the Preservation of Religion and Liberty, but ended in the ruin of them both; That an Army turned their Arms against them from whom they received their Commission; (B) That a *Covenant* was first entred into for the *Defence of the King*, and afterwards (to the astonishment of many that had taken it) made use of by others against his *Person and Authority*. (C)

(B) *Prinnes E-*  
pistle before  
his Speech of  
Decemb. 4.

1648.—

‘It is clear

‘that the very

‘Officers and

‘the Army,

‘being not our Masters but Servants, particularly raised, waged, and

‘engaged by Solemn League and Covenant, among other things, to pro-

‘tect and defend the Parliaments and Members Rights, Priviledges and

‘Persons from all force and violence whatsoever, in such manner as both

‘Houses and the Committee of both Kingdoms should approve, cannot

‘pretend the least shadow of Reason or Authority from the Law of God

‘or Man, thus traiterously to seize, imprison and seclude us, without

‘the Houses License, before any particular Charge against us.

(C) See

(C) See the Declaration of the Army at St. Albans, (Novemb. 16. 1648.) presented to the House by the Army Officers, wherein they demand the bringing the King to a speedy Tryal. In this Remonstrance they say; Whereas It might be objected, that by the Covenant they were obliged to the Preservation of his Majesties Person and Authority, it was with this Restriction, In the Preservation of the True Religion and Liberties of the Kingdom; So that, considering Religion and the Publick Interest were to be understood the Principal and Supream Matters engaged for, and the Kings Person and Authority as Inferior and Subordinate thereto; And whereas the Preservation of his Person and Authority was not consistent with the Preservation of Religion and the Publick Interest, they were therefore by the Covenant obliged against it:

The Clause in the Covenant to which they refer is Art. 3.

On the other side, the Secluded Members remind the Army Officers of the Solemn League and Covenant, by which (they say) they were obliged to preserve the Kings Person and Dignity from violence; and give this among other Reasons for their Voting the Kings Answer Satisfactory, &c.

I know 'tis unreasonable to charge men with all the Consequences of their Principles, when they not only declare against those Consequences which are charged upon them, but also protest against them by their Practise, as many Gentlemen did, especially after they were surpris'd with the Votes of *No further Addresses to the King*. And therefore I shall not here enquire into the Nature and Tendency of the Covenant, Declaration, Remonstrances &c. of those times, which have been so often quoted both for and against adhering to the King. However all men of Conscience and Loyalty may from hence learn, how easie it is, for a Leading and Potent Faction to strein the Consequences of

(D) Mr. Baxter in his Preface to the

Cure of

Church-Divisions. I have seen how confidently the Killing of the King, the Rebellious demolishing of the Government of the Land, the killing of many thousands of their Brethren, the turnings and overturnings of all kinds of Rule, even that which they themselves set up, have been committed, and justified, and prophanely Fathered upon God.

of things, and how little all Arguments signifie to them that have gotten the Sword into their Hands. (D)

To conclude this Head; Let it be the peculiar honour of Papists and *Turks* to propagate their Religion with Sword and Bloodshed; Let us regulate our Zeal with Prudence, Obedience and Charity, which make up the truly Christian Temper of English Protestants; Let no private Passion or Interest transport us beyond the bounds of our Duty to God and our Allegiance to our Sovereign: For if they do, we shall convince all Impartial men, that we have as little sense of True Religion as our Adversaries of *Rome*.

(E) *Eccles.*  
10. 20.  
(F) *St. Jude,*  
*ver. 8.*

You have seen the Operation of these Principles in the inciting and animating the People to Tumults and Commotions; Evil Principles brought forth Seditious Words, and they were quickly followed with Seditious Practises against the Government: But those Holy Scriptures which (blessed be God) you have in your own Language, forbid you *To curse the King in your thought*: (E) *To despise Dominion and speak evil of Dignities*: (F) They com-

command you to pray for the King, and for all that are in Authority; (G) and to be (G) 1 Tim. 2.1. Subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake. (H) Rom. 13.5.

2. As we desire to keep out Popery, and strengthen the Interest of the Reformation, let us beware of contributing any thing towards the subverting of the Church of *England*. A Church which is the most Impregnable Bulwark of the Protestant Cause; A Church which hath the Support of Scripture and Antiquity; of purity of Doctrine, and Piety of Devotion; and therefore the busie Factors for the *Roman* Religion have made use of more Arts and Instruments for destroying this, than any other Church in Christendom. But whether will the misguided Zeal of some men transport them? Whilst one Faction labours to break it in pieces, as the most probable means of introducing Popery; the other strives to overthrow the Constitution of it out of Zeal against Popery! Our Liturgy (for they have not much to say against our Articles of Doctrine) is but the Masse-Book translated into *English*; Our Church-Government Antichristian, and our Ceremonies but Popish Trumpery! And yet the Compilers of our Liturgy (the Bishops and Episcopal Divines) suffered Martyrdom by the hands of the Papists; they had the Substance of our Liturgy, the same kind of Episcopacy,

cy, the same Rites and Ceremonies with us. I do not say, That no Constitutions of our Church are capable of being explained or amended; for what Church under Heaven is perfect in all matters of Doctrine and Worship, of Order and Discipline? But did we lay aside all Prejudices and groundless Disaffections; did we allow to them the same (Favour shall I say or) Common Equity, which is allowed to all other things of Humane Composition, we should not only be freed from the loud clamours of Antichristianism and Popery, but we might assure our selves that Popery can never enter into our Church, whilst the Established Doctrine and Liturgy, Government and Order are preserved. For

(1) See Article the 6th. Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scripture for Salvation. 9th. Of Original Sin. 11th. Of the Justification of Man. 14th. Of works of Supererogation. 15th. Of Christ alone

1. Doth the Church of *England* impose any other Doctrines as necessary to Salvation, besides *That Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*? Is our Creed swelled of late by the Addition of any of the new Articles of the *Roman Church*? (1) without Sin. 19th, and 20th. Of the Church. 21st. Of the Authority of General Councils. 22d. Of Purgatory. 24th. Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understand not. 25th. Of the Sacraments. 28th. Of the Supper of the Lord. 29th. Of the Wicked, &c. 30th. Of both Kinds. 31st. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross. 32d. Of the Marriage of Priests. 34th. Of the Traditions of the Church. 36th. Of the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers. 37th. Of the Civil Magistrate.

And

And *Sancta Clara*, that went about to reconcile our Articles with the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, might as well have attempted to reconcile the Masse-Book with the *Alcoran*.

2. As to the Liturgy; How many uncertain Stories and Legends, Responds, Verses, vain Repetitions, Commemorations, &c. have our Reformers cast out? How many Anthems and Invitatories have they cut off, which did break the continual course of reading the Scriptures? How many of the principal points of Popery are countervailed in our Liturgy?

(L) But they that make this Objection, I suppose (to say no worse) never read either the Popish or our Service-Book. (M) *V. G.* The Cup in the Holy Eucharist restored to the Laity. The Mediation of the blessed Virgin *Mary*, the Holy Apostles, and Saints departed; the Merit of our good Works; the Sacrifice of the Masse; Transubstantiation; and the Adoration of the Host; five of the *Romish* Sacraments; Prayer for the Dead; and the Superstitious Ceremonies of Baptism expressly excluded.

(M) See the former part of the Morning Prayer; the Liturgy, Communion Service, &c.

3. To come to the Episcopal Government of the Church of *England*; 'It is very well known (saith B. Sanderson in the Preface to his Sermons) to many, what rejoicing the Vote (for pulling down of Episcopacy) brought to the *Romish* Party; how even in *Rome* it self they sung their Io---

N

Radns

*Paans upon the Tidings thereof, and said triumphantly, Now the Day is Ours; now is the Fatal Blow given to the Protestant Religion in England. A thing little considered by them that were for Reforming the Church by the Extirpation of Popery and Prelacy, and opposed the Roman Cause by the Abolition of that Government, which the Strength and Policy of Rome have been so long employed against.*

Do not all Historians agree, That as the *Monks and Friars* were found to be more serviceable to the Papacy, than the *Prelates*; so the Popes enlarged their Priviledges, granted them Exemptions from Episcopal Jurisdiction, and all the Opposition of the Bishops against them have signified little in the Court of Rome, so long as their Interest and Grandeur were maintain'd by those Creatures and Vassals of the Roman See.

V. G. Gregory the 9th. published two Bulls, forbidding all Bishops to exercise any Jurisdiction over them. (N) The following Popes confirmed their Priviledges; and though some of them (wearied with the Complaints of the Bishops) confined them within certain Limits, yet others revoked their Constitutions, granted them new and more ample Charters, null'd all former Bulls of Restriction, and Decreed that they were immediately Subject to the Pope, and to none else.

This

(N) Greg.  
Diet. l. 5. tit.  
31. c. 16. 17.  
Greg. 9. uni-  
versis Ecclesia-  
rum Prelatis.



This Design was all along aimed at in the Institutions of the Regular Clergy ; and the Popes and Court of *Rome* always appear'd in it as much as they durst. But the Complaints of the Bishops and Secular Clergy became so Universal, that at length they fix'd upon a new project, set up the Order of the Jesuites, (or Spiritual Janizaries) by whom they have ever since exercis'd an absolute Tyranny over the Bishops as well as the Parochial Clergy and People. The Immunities and Privileges conferr'd upon them are such as these ; ' *To Preach, hear Confessions, open their Schools, without License of the Bishops or Universities ; to administer Sacraments, and instruct Youth ; to Correct, Interpret, Expunge and Burn such Books as they dislike, &c.* (O) Thus were the Bishops in the *Roman* Church stript of their Authority, the Government of the People committed to mere Priests ; and a Jesuite, by Delegation from the Pope, may ordain Priests too as well as the Bishops.

(O) V. Bullar.  
Cherub. tom. 1.  
p. 653, 154.  
Where the several Bulls or Charters of Priviledges are enumerated.

We see the Pope and Court of *Rome* are no great Friends to a Popish, and do you think they have more kindness for a Protestant Episcopacy ? By whose means did *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, *Hooper*, *Farrar* and *Latimer* suffer Martyrdom ? Did not those Holy Men exercise the same Power and Jurisdiction then, which our Bishops do at this day ? Is the same kind of Episcopacy Popish in our Times, that was Hereti-

ca in theirs? Were they esteemed by the Papists their most formidable Enemies, and are their Successors become their Secret Friends? In Fine, How can you give credit to the Popish Plot, and at the same time brand those very persons with the Infamous Names of Papists and *Popishly affected*, which were to be made Examples of Popish Cruelty? Hath not the first Discoverer of the Plot acquainted you with the Names of them, which were to be put into their Places?

But I cannot pass over that memorable Passage of B. Hall in his Speech to the House of Peers; 'Speaking of the base and 'scurrilous Libels and Pamphlets, wherewith 'the Governours of the Church had been overborn, and in which Papists and Prelates like 'Oxen in a Yoke, were matched together; O my Lords I beseech you to be sensible of this 'great Indignity; do but look on these Reverend Persons; do not your Lordships see here 'sitting on these Benches, those that have 'spent their time, their Strength, their Bodies and Lives, in preaching down and writing down Popery; and which would be ready, if occasion were offered, to sacrifice all 'their old Blood that remains, to the maintenance of that Truth of God, which they 'have taught and written: And shall we be 'thus despatchfully ranged with them, whom we 'do thus professedly oppose? (P)

(B. Hall's Speech, quoted in a late Book, entitled, The unreasonable-ness of Separation, the Second Part. (1682.) p. 45.

But

But the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England* are Popish and Superstitious!

And yet we have no Adorations of Saints, Angels, or any other created Beings; no Superstitious Consecrations of Bells, Candles, Salt, Water, &c. Hath not our Church put a manifest Difference between Naked Ceremonies and Superstitious Parts of Divine Worship? Don't She reject all Opinion of Merit and Spiritual Efficacy, and expressly declare that they are Things in their own Nature Indifferent and Alterable? In short, Would those men which make this Objection, apply their Minds to the Study of the Popish and Protestant Doctrine, I believe we should hear no more of this Groundless Calumny.

But to them which fasten this Odious Imputation upon our Church and Church-men, I will only say these three Things.

1. It is the highest Injustice and Uncharitableness: For did ever any Order of men write with more Learning and Judgment, with more Zeal and Vigour against Popery, than the Episcopal Clergy of *England* have done? Have

they not always been the Principal ( I had almost said the only ) Champions in this Nation to maintain the Protestant Cause ? Did they ( when under the Heaviest Persecution ) ever truck with the Papists for a General Toleration ? Or have they ( since the Kings Return ) endeavoured to procure an Indulgence or Abolition of the Laws against them ? Did they not boldly and honestly give the Nation Warning of the Danger of Popery, before the breaking out of the Popish Plot ?

I remember that a few Years since, some Eminent Dissenters from the Church of England, instead of joyning with us against the Assaults of a Common Enemy, spoke very kindly of the *Common and Innocent Papists*, as they were pleased to stile them : And yet God forbid I should either charge this on the Body of Dissenters, or say those very persons were *Popish or Popishly affected*. I pray God open their eyes to see the Danger of Joyning with the Papists for a General Toleration, and taking the same Course to keep out Popery, which the Papists do to bring it in. ( R )

( R ) Since the Declaration of Indulgence, a

little Book was drawn up by one Man ( but with the Consent of several Non-conformists ) with a Design to present it to the Parliament, and published under this Title, *The Peaceable Design; or an Account of the Non-conformists Meetings*, by some Ministers of London, An. 1675. In this Book an Objection is put; But what shall

shall we say then to the Papists? The Answer is, The Papist in our Account is but one Sort of Recusants, and the Consciencious and Peaceable among them, must be held in the same Predicament with those among our selves, that likewise refuse to come to Common Prayer:—— But as for the Common Papist, who lives Innocently in his Way, he is to us as other Separatists, and so comes under the like Toleration.

This Book was reprinted an. 1680. and with some small Alterations.

Since the breaking out of the Plot Mr. Baxter (as I find him quoted in the forementioned Book called *The unreasonableness of Separation*; (part 2.) tells us; Mr. H. is a Man of Latitude, and tyeth himself to no Party or Opinions of other men; and I so little fear the Noise of the Censorious, that even now while the Plot doth render them most Odious, say freely 3

1. That I would have Papists used like Men. (I hope this Advice is needless to English Protestants.)

2. I would have no man put to death for being a Priest.

3. I would have no Writ De Excommunicato Capiendo, or any Law compel them to our Communion and Sacraments.

2. You cannot have forgotten, That they which first joyned Popery and Prelacy, quickly saw the Romish Papacy and Scottish Presbytery linked together.

Presbytery is Babylon, Egypt a Limb of Antichrist, a Tyrannycal Lordly Government, a worse Bondage than that under the Bishops.

Antichristian Tyranny under the name of a Christian Presbyterian Church-Government.

An Episcopal Tyranny exchanged for a Presbyterian Slavery.

*'The Presbyterian is a Bloody Unpeaceable, and Persecuting way.*

*'Presbytery is more Tyrannical than Episcopacy, because one Tyrant is not so bad as many together.*

*'The Divines of the Assembly are Anti-Christian, Romish, Bloody, Baals Priests, &c.*

This was the Language of the Sectaries in the late Times.

3. Have you never heard what Advantage *Parsons, Kellison* and others have made of such Calumnies as these, to the disgrace of the Reformed Religion? Is not this the Way to gratifie the *Romish Faction*? Will they not be emboldened in their Attempts against us and our Religion, when the Governours of our Church and the Body of the Episcopal Clergy are represented as their Secret Friends; or at least as not Hearty and Zealous in the Protestant Cause? Sure it must raise their Hopes of reducing the *Romish Religion*, to hear that they are now marching towards Popery, which used to be looked upon as their most Formidable Adversaries.

But so much of this unreasonable and groundless Charge.

I will now sum up this whole Argument as briefly as I can. You (that dissent from the established Church of *England*) are concerned in good earnest (as I believe many of you are) to maintain the Reformed Religion against the Abominations of Popery; I would then offer to your consideration, That you cannot reasonably hope to keep out Popery without a National settlement; (for how can a multitude of petty Sects and divided Interests, maintain their ground against the *Roman Forces*?) that according to the Principles of the present Separation, a National Settlement can hardly be expected.

*V.G.* If things Indifferent are unlawful in the Worship of God, the same Objection will for ever lie against any Constitutions that should succeed in the room of ours, and you must divide and subdivide to the Worlds end. The same Principle which first led Men to the decrying of *Kneeling at the Sacrament, wearing a Surplice, and the Cross in Baptism*; afterwards led them into *Independency, Quakerism, &c.* They which cryed out against the Impositions of our Church, could never set up a better (or any Established) Church, or agree upon one way of Worship and Government among themselves,

Some

Some of the Dissenters did ingenuously confess (in the late Times) that upon the pulling down the Establishments of our Church, more Sects and Heresies sprang up within a very few years, than were ever known in the Kingdom before. But I will only appeal to the Testimonies of two Eminent Persons of the *Presbyterian* Persuasion; some of whose words I have transcribed in the

(S) *Gangrena*, Margent (S).

by Th. Edwards

(Ed. 3. 1646.)

In the Epistle Dedicatory to the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. You have, most Noble Senators, done worthily against *Papists*, *Prelates*, and Scandalous Ministers, in casting down Images, Altars, Crucifixes, throwing out Ceremonies, &c. but what have you done against other kinds of growing Evils, Heresie, Schism, Disorder, against *Seekers*, *Anabaptists*, *Antinomians*, *Brownists*, *Libertines*, and other Sects? — You have made a Reformation; but with the Reformation have we not a *Deformation*, and worse things come in upon us than ever we had before? Were any of those Monsters heard of heretofore, which are now common among us? as denying the Scriptures, pleading for a *Toleration* of all Religions and Worships; yea, for Blasphemy, and denying there is a God. You have put down the Book of *Common Prayer*, and there are many among us have put down the Scriptures, &c. — You have cast out the *Bishops* and their Officers; and we have many that cast down to the ground all Ministers in all the Reformed Churches. You have cast out Ceremonies in the Sacraments, as the *Cross*, *Kneeling* at the Lords Supper; and we have many cast out the Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lords Supper, &c. — If *Schism*, *Heresie*, &c. be let alone, and rise proportionably for one year longer, we shall need no Cavaliers nor Enemies from without to destroy us.

Mr. Baxter's Preface to the Cure of Church Divisions. I have long stood by while Churches have been divided and subdivided, one Congregation of the Division labouring to make the other contemptible and odious; and this called, *The Preaching of Truth*,



and the Purer worshipping of God. I have seen this grow up to the height of *Ranters* in horrid Blasphemies, and then of *Quakers*, in disdainful Pride and Surliness; and into the way of *Seekers*, that were to seek for a Ministry, a Church, a Scripture, and consequently a Christ. — I have lived to see it put to the question in that which they called the *Little Parliament*, Whether all the Ministers of the Parishes of England should be put down at once?

‘Two ways especially (said Mr. Baxter, since the Restauration of the King and the Church of England) ‘Popery will grow out of our Divisions.

1. ‘By the Odium and Scorn of our Disagreements, Inconsistency, and multiplied ‘Sects; they will persuade People, that we must come for Unity to them, or else run mad, and crumble into Dust and Individuals. Thousands have been drawn to ‘Popery, or confirmed in it by this Argument already; and I am persuaded, that all the Arguments else in Bellarmine, and all other Books that ever were written, have not done so much to make Papists in England, as the multitude of Sects among ourselves, &c.

2. ‘Who knoweth not how fair a Game the Papists have to play by the means of our Divisions? — Who is so blind as not to see their double Game and Hopes; viz. That either our Divisions and Alienations will carry men to such distances and practices, as shall make us accounted Seditious, Rebellious, and dangerous to the ‘Publick.

'Publick Peace, and so they may pass for  
 'better Subjects than we; or else, that  
 'when so many Parties under Sufferings are  
 'constrained to beg and wait for liberty, the  
 'Papiſts may not be shut out alone, but have  
 'Toleration in the rest. And shall they use  
 'our Hands to do their works, and pull their  
 'freedom out of the fire? We have already  
 'unspeakably served them, both in this, and  
 'in abating the Odium of the Gunpowder-  
 'Plot, and their other Treasons, Insurrec-  
 'tions, and Spanish Invasion, &c. (T)

(T) Defence of  
 the Cure, &c.  
 p. 52, 53, 54.  
 (Printed  
 1671.)

But we cannot joyn with the Church  
 of England (as now Establiſhed) with a  
 safe Conscience! and we ought not to  
 provide for the security of our Religion  
 by sinning against God.

I Answer. Since you are under Laws  
 and Government;

1. You may (with a safe Conscience)  
 submit to all such conditions of Com-  
 munion, as you do not believe to be sinful.  
 And either all the Gospel Precepts of O-  
 bedience signifie nothing at all, or they  
 signifie thus much, That you ought to  
 come up to Authority, as far as you can  
 without disobeying the Commands of  
 God.

2. You may with a safe Conscience  
 make the most favourable construction  
 of all doubtful things, which they are  
 fairly capable of,

3. You

3. You are not bound in Conscience to affront the Established Religion and Government.

4. You are bound to make Conscience of one Duty, and one Sin as well as another. Are not the Obedience and Peaceableness, doing Justly, loving Mercy, and walking Humbly with God, matters of Duty? Are not Spiritual Pride and Contumaciousness, False Accusations and Slandering, Schism and Sedition, forbidden by the Law of God?

Could Men be perswaded thus far (and there is all the reason in the World that they should) they would seek out for Information, and not take up Objections upon trust; they would proportion their Zeal to the nature of things, and yield to a restraint of their liberty (in all things not sinful) for the Peace of the Church; the number of Dissenters would be lessened, and they would joyn with us in opposing the Common Enemy; they would take the most effectual course to incline their Superiours to pity them, and secure the Peace of their own Consciences.

But it is time to draw to a Conclusion of the Whole. Let us not express our Zeal against *Papery*, by Swearing and Hectoring against it, by Cursing and Drinking to its Confusion; by Sedition and Faction, by Vices or Immoralities of  
what

what kind soever; for these are the ready ways to bring it in.

But as the Piety and Zeal of our first Reformers banished Popery out of our Confessions of Faith and Publick Offices, so let us banish it out of our Hearts and Lives; and particularly let us sincerely put in practise those Vertues which the Reformed Religion teaches, as opposed to Popery; viz. Serious Devotion to God, and inflexible Loyalty to our Sovereign, Christian Meekness and Charity, Truth and Fidelity toward all Men.

Let us first make use of all lawful Means, (for the Divine Providence supposeth the use of all honest Means for the prevention of impendent Dangers) and then make our fervent and constant Addresses to the Throne of Grace for a Blessing upon our just Endeavours.

But what good and wholesom Laws are fit to be made for the strengthening the *Protestant* Interest, and the keeping out of *Popery*, doth not become Persons of a private Capacity too nicely to determine.

I am not speaking to Law-Makers, but to such as are tied up to the Laws in being; nor do I think my self able to determine, what further Laws may be made for the securing the Church and Kingdom (against all future Machinations of the *Papists*, or promoting a firm and

and lasting Union amongst our selves. These Considerations are to be left to Authority.

In fine, Let us lay aside all private Animosities and secular Ends in matters of Religion, and study the true Celestial Wisdom, which is first pure, then peaceable, mild, and easie to be intreated; full of mercy and good works, without partiality, and without hypocrisie. So shall we confute the Calumnies of the Romish Emissaries, and adorn the Doctrine of God our Saviour; engage the Divine Providence to take care of us and our Religion, and be rewarded with the fruit of Righteousness, which is sown in peace for them that make peace.

---

## ERRATA.

PAG. 37. lin. 27. read *Murderer*, p. 49. in the Margent *Roffius*, p. 63. in the Marg. *Coerubini*, p. 67. in the Margent *Spondanus*, p. 70. l. 29. *Men*, p. 78. l. 6. after *maſi* add *not*.

## FINIS